

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

FIRST CHALLENGE TO DR. CAHILL.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—I understand the Rev. Dr. Cahill, who is to preach to-morrow in Coleraine, has promised that he will prove the truth of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He is generally considered a clever man, but, in this instance, he has undertaken a task which all the men in Europe could not accomplish. My late father has so completely and irrefragably exposed the absurdity of this doctrine, that I could not pretend to be able to throw much new light upon it from the field of argument alone. He has placed it in a position which it never occupied before his day, and from which, to the end of time, it will never be released. Therefore, in place of attempting to *argue* the subject at present, I will just put it to the plain, *practical* test—a test which is intelligible to the meanest capacity. Dr. Cahill maintains that he can transubstantiate or change the wafer, *in its very substance, into the real body of Christ*. But the question comes, can he really do this, or does he, in point of fact, believe that he can? Is he sincere in his assertions?—assertions in which all the Priests of Rome unite. If he is, he cannot possibly object to submit to the practical test; and, if he is not, the sooner he ceases to delude the people the better. Now, I hereby publicly undertake to subscribe One Hundred Pounds to the Roman Catholic Chapel in Coleraine, provided Dr. Cahill will satisfy me of the truth of Transubstantiation; and I also hereby publicly state the proof with which I will be satisfied on the subject. I will make a wafer, and hold it in my own hand till he performs his ceremony of transformation over it. I will not allow him to take it out of my hand, as he might then substitute a different wafer; but I will place it with my fingers on his tongue, when he is to swallow it. He must swallow it fairly and honestly within my sight; and, to prevent mistakes, he must also allow me to examine the inside of his mouth there and then. He must remain for six hours, directly after swallowing the wafer, under my immediate observation, without swallowing anything else. The wafer must lie on his stomach during these six hours. If he does all this to my satisfaction, and lives one week after it, the money

is to be paid. This, I think, will be a fair test of his own belief in the truth of his doctrine. If he really believes it, he cannot object, because the most poisonous substance I can use would be perfectly harmless if it were converted into the real body of Christ. It would not then be a poison, but real flesh and blood. It is of no use to say the priest could have full power over the wafer composed merely of flour and water, but his power ceases the moment any poisonous substance is introduced. This is virtually acknowledging his total incapacity, because it would be as easy to change the one substance into flesh as the other. The man who would be satisfied with an excuse of that description, *coming from the mouths of individuals who claim miraculous power*, deserves to be pardoned for his simplicity.

"Since God stretched the heavens over the earth," says my late father, "there has not been broached in human language, an absurdity so monstrous as that of Transubstantiation. That a bit of bread is converted into a full-grown human body, while to all the senses it remains unchanged, and that this is the real body of Jesus, that was born of the Virgin, crucified in Jerusalem, and now in heaven, is an assertion so shocking to common sense, that without the clearest evidence, it could not be credited that ever it was believed by any rational being!" I must confess I have great difficulty in thinking the man is sane who *does* believe it. If he were to reason and act in the same way in regard to worldly affairs, he would, by common consent, be placed in a lunatic asylum.

As Dr. Cahill will be out of Coleraine before your paper is published, I beg to state here, that I this evening put a copy of this letter into the Post-office, directed for him, at Coleraine, and he must receive it, at farthest, on to-morrow morning, before his lecture commences.

As I detest anonymous writing, and as I never feared the "face of clay" in the support of truth, I subscribe myself—

Yours truly,

Coleraine, May 25th, 1853.

SECOND CHALLENGE TO DR. CAHILL.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—A considerable time has now elapsed since I sent my challenge to Dr. Cahill, but he has not yet made any reply. His silence has been accounted for in various ways by his followers. Some say he occupies such an exalted position that he considers me beneath his notice. The public are best able to judge in this matter, and I willingly leave the decision in their hands. He could not adopt an easier way of getting out of his present difficulty than by assuming an air of overwhelming importance. With some parties this course may have the effect of covering his inglorious retreat; but it establishes beyond contradiction that he bears no relationship to the meek and lowly Jesus. If he were His servant, his conduct would be very different. Apart, however, altogether from the question as to which of us belongs to the most respectable profession, the *money* I offered was surely worth looking after. He has often taken a great deal of trouble for far less; and his refusal, in this instance, to earn one hundred pounds, is a very certain proof that he has no confidence in his own powers. There is another view of this matter which is of more importance than even his own assumed dignity. If he could pass through the ordeal of my experiment successfully, he would do more to establish his cause than all that has been done by his predecessors, either by argument or by butchery, since the days of Pope Alexander the 6th, whose life was so infamous, *although he was the head of the infallible church*, that it rendered him a blot upon the most degraded humanity.

Again, it has been stated that he would not reply to a layman. This is a very poor excuse, because he has already answered clergymen of different denominations, although *he* considers them all laymen. According to his view, every man is a layman who is not ordained in the Church of Rome. It has been further stated, and, I believe, correctly, that he will not accept a challenge from any person whatever. This, certainly, is a wise arrangement. He knows right well his opinions are utterly untenable, and, therefore, the farther he keeps them from the light the better. They are far better adapted for those who prostrate their intellect below the level

of the brute creation, than for individuals who exercise those noble endowments—reason and common sense—which render man the lord of all he surveys. There is one very important difference, however, between my challenge and those he has received from other parties. They have asked him to enter upon a tedious discussion, which would entail a great deal of labour upon himself; but I have been contented by merely calling upon him to prove the *sincerity of his own faith* by swallowing a wafer. This is a simple operation, which could be done in a few minutes, and, if he really possessed the power of transubstantiating, it could not possibly do him any harm. Others would put him to trouble without any profit; but I have offered him a handsome bonus if he comes off victorious. My method may be called the short and certain test for Popery. It is a great deal too certain, however, for Dr. Cahill to try it. He knows very well that he could not escape. In discussion, he might blindfold his audience by the power of his eloquence, but there is no room for rhetorical display in swallowing the wafer—it would soon settle the question on the one side or the other.

Further, it has been very bombastically said that Dr. Cahill might safely swallow my wafer as I would not venture to put the poison into it, lest I might be hanged for so doing. I have only to say let him try me, and then he will be able to judge for himself. I pledge him my word and honour that it will not only contain poison, but also that I will put the speediest, strongest, and most concentrated poisons into it which I can combine. He need not imagine I am going to throw away my money without having value for it. I have not the least fear for the consequences. The “shilly shally” boys who raise these objections will not catch me so easy as they think. I never said that I would put the wafer down Dr. Cahill's throat. I would merely place it on his tongue, and then he might either swallow it or spit it out as he thought proper. The swallowing of it would be his own act, not mine. At all events let him just give me *one trial*, and the result will speak for itself.

Another reason which has been assigned, with a very triumphant air, for his silence, is, that it is bread, not poison, he pretends to transubstantiate, and, therefore, that my test is not a fair one. I am well aware that the wily advocates of Popery have foreseen all the difficulties which would be thrown in their way, and, on that account, have been wise enough to exclude poisonous substances from the list of those things over which they pretend to have control. In this way they

may blindfold those who are easily duped; but I am determined not to be foiled or deceived. I will leave no hole for Dr. Cahill to creep out at. I will hunt him from his hiding-place, I care not where it is. Whilst I utterly deny that any objection whatever regarding the poisoned wafer can hold good in reference to this man who claims miraculous power, and asks—"can we not do what Moses did, when we have got the Holy Ghost to enable us to do so?", I am, nevertheless, disposed to give him a trial, on such terms as must be admitted by the most rigid Romanist to be totally unobjectionable. I will now make a proposal, which is not open to the most trifling objection—not even to the one which represents the ingredients used as being spoiled by coming in contact with my unholy and unsanctified hands

The Priests of Rome profess to be able to convert the *wine* into the *real blood* of Christ. They profess to do this really and substantially—that it is no longer wine but blood. Now, if Dr. Cahill satisfies me that he can do this, I will subscribe one hundred pounds to any Roman Catholic Chapel he names. I here state my conditions—he must satisfy me that the material used is really and truly good and pure port wine of the full strength; and that this same wine, without any dilution, and no other, is used in the entire experiment. In short, that from first to last everything is honestly and fairly done. The wine is to be kept fairly and fully in my view all the time till it is swallowed. He is to transubstantiate it, and then, without taking it out of my sight, or using any means whatever for diluting or changing it, he is to cause a youth whom *I* will name to drink one quart of it. The youth must remain in my presence for six hours immediately after swallowing the said wine. There must not be any means used for preventing its effects upon him. It must remain on his stomach for six hours without any interference. If all those things are done in such a way as I am satisfied there is no deceit, and the wine fails to make the youth *drunk*, I will pay the money. In order that I may have no way, after all is over, of evading the penalty, I will state at every stage of the proceedings whether or not I am satisfied as far as Dr. Cahill has gone. And further, for the satisfaction of my opponents, I will choose a Roman Catholic youth, and not a Protestant, to drink the wine. I will give Dr. Cahill the power of choosing one out of six individuals named by me. If he thinks this number too small, I am ready to extend it to five and twenty. The reason why I insist on naming the individual is, that he might select one who could drink the quart of wine with perfect impunity.

Here, now, is a simple challenge, against which no feasible excuse can be raised ; and it will be a fair test of the power of the Priest. If he can do what he professes—if he can convert *wine* into the *real blood* of Christ, of course it will lose all its intoxicating qualities, and I must lose my money. A man would not get drunk on a hog'shead of it.

Dr. Cahill has not accepted my first challenge for this simple reason—he knows right well he does not possess the power which he assumes. He does not, he could not, believe it himself ; and it is a shame for him to impose upon the ignorant multitude. His deluded followers may say he could not transubstantiate the *poisoned* wafer, because Jesus did not do this himself ; but he is too knowing to come out with this objection in his own name. Every argument adduced on this head only adds increased strength to my second challenge, because it goes on the supposition that he has the power if there was no poison used. I do not ask to put any poison in the wine, and still I am sure he will never try the experiment with it either. If he does overlook it, however, it will prove, beyond doubt, that he is a regular impostor.

I understand the Roman Catholics are excessively angry about my challenge. There is no doubt it has made them grind their teeth with venom. Thank Goodness, however, they have not the power of establishing the Inquisition in the realms of our gracious Queen. If they had I would not long escape. Still their anger is very childish, because they ought to know it is my duty to tell them plainly what I think about their religion, and their duty to act in the same straightforward manner towards me when they think me in the wrong. A *discussion* they could bear with ; but the plump, homely, intelligible, and practical test, which they cannot by any sophistry or ingenuity evade, cuts them to the core.

Yours, very truly,

Coleraine, June 14th, 1853.

FIRST LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—I do not pretend that my reading is sufficiently extensive to enable me to discuss the various dogmas of Popery; but any person possessed of ordinary reasoning powers can, without difficulty, reply to the statements set forth in the sermon on Transubstantiation delivered by Dr. Cahill in Coleraine. I am not vain enough to think I can handle this sermon in the same strain of powerful, natural, and highly persuasive eloquence in which it was handled, on last Sunday evening, by the Ven. the Archdeacon of Derry; nor do I imagine I can meet its sophistries with the same vigorous and overwhelming arguments with which they will hereafter be met by the Rev. Dr. Huston, of Macosquin. I am, moreover, ready to acknowledge that almost all the arguments I can adduce are founded upon principles which I have derived either from the pulpit ministrations or the published writings of the late Dr. Carson, the humble pastor of the Baptist Church at Tubbermore. To be the son of this man, who, by public consent, stood pre-eminent as a scholar, a philologist, a critic, and a Christian philosopher—who, by his writings, made himself known in the most remote corners of the christianised world—and who, for the sake of his conscience, sacrificed all his worldly advantages—I consider a far higher honour than if my veins were filled with blood from all the Royalty of Europe. I confess I am proud of my birth; but yet I would not receive my father's opinions unless they were in the strictest accordance with the deductions of my own reason. It is to God, not man, we must render an account.

Notwithstanding I only presume to follow in the wake of the parties I have mentioned, I still think it will serve a useful purpose to criticise, in my own homely way, and through the columns of the newspaper press, which afford a most convenient and ready access to all classes of society, this sermon of Dr. Cahill, in praise of which so much has been said. His eloquence and sophistry seem to have blinded the eyes of his audience. It was even said he would have converted the devil himself. A Rev. Doctor has very pertinently asked—Was the devil not converted before Dr. Cahill began?

To prove the doctrine of Transubstantiation, Dr. Cahill says—"I never bring forward anything but *from the Scriptures*—I never bring forward the fathers or councils, nor do I ever *insult* any man into Catholicity; but I *reason*, I *persuade* him into it." Pray, Dr. Cahill, how does it come that you treat this subject differently from others which you hold? Do you hold the Scriptures as the only rule of faith, or do you consider yourself at liberty to depart from them whenever it suits your purpose? Have you any other reason for the course you have adopted but that you think you can manage to twist and turn the words of scripture to your own advantage? If it suited your purpose, could you not sink the Scriptures to the bottom of the sea? At present, you have adopted a very wary plan. You think it will take Protestants off their guard, when you profess such reverence for the Scriptures that you do not think it necessary to go beyond them for the proof of your doctrine. I only hope you will stick to this resolution of abiding by the Scriptures.

You tell us you only *reason* and *persuade* men into Catholicity. This is exceedingly kind in you, and it is very gratifying to all who have heard of it. What a pity it is the same course had not been adopted at all periods of the history of your Church! It would have prevented an amount of persecution, torture, murder, rapine, cruelty, and brutality which is without a parallel in the whole history of the world. Who could possibly forget the barbarities your Church has committed? The ingenuity of the devil and all his emissaries could add nothing whatever to them. I know not how you can hold up your head so long as they remain registered on the records of time. Where is the arithmetician who could count the number of those who have suffered death, and far more than death itself, under the horrid and unrelenting sway of your Church? Surely she is glutted with the blood of the saints.

Can it be possible, Dr. Cahill, you think you could make us believe you would confine yourself to *reasoning* and *persuasion*, if you had the *power* to do otherwise? Does your Church not inculcate the extirpation of heretics by fire and sword? Are not all its members bound to do whatever they are bid? Do you not consider your Church *infallible*, *unchanged*, and *unchangeable*? Is not this the thing in which you glory in contradistinction from those who, you say, are ever varying? If so, what reason is there to conclude that your persecuting spirit has ceased? If you are *infallible*, everything you have already done *must* be right, and, under

similar circumstances, *must always be repeated*. To deny this is to deny your infallibility. If you are *unchanged* and *unchangeable*, you must again persecute as you have previously done, provided only you had the power. To deny this is to confess that you are changed and changeable, and, therefore, fallible. I do not mean to say that every man who is formally connected with Popery must act in this way; but most certainly every man who is really, truly, and in heart, a Papist, *must* do as I have said. He cannot act otherwise and be true to his own principles. How many of your brother priests and of their deluded flocks were there who were anxious to see the Maidai released from the dungeons into which they were cast by spiritual tyranny, for the great crime of reading the Word of God? If your persecuting spirit has ceased, why did you not all rise as one man and petition for their delivery from the bonds of oppression? You are all very sweet when you live in a Protestant country; but I ask you, plainly, what sort of *reasoning* and *persuasion* do you adopt, at present, in Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, and every country under the power of your infallible head, the Pope? Is not Popery synonymous with intellectual degradation, civil and religious tyranny, oppression, persecution, darkness, and misery of mind and of body? It is not Popery, but Christianity alone, which can secure liberty of conscience, either civil or religious, and render man "great, glorious, and free."

"Let me tell you at the outset," says Dr. Cahill, "what part *reason* has in religion. *Well, then, it has no part at all.*" Well done, Dr. Cahill. You now acknowledge that the doctrines of Catholicity have nothing to do with religion. Did you intend this?—or have your inconsistencies come out without your being aware of it? You tell us you will *reason* a man into Catholicity; and, in the next breath, you say *reason* has nothing to do in religion. It follows, as a matter of course, that you do not consider Catholicity is religion; or else you are driven to the very disagreeable necessity of *reasoning* about a thing with which, you say, *reason* has nothing to do? Error will never square with itself. Your critical talents are here rendered very conspicuous. You undertake to reason your hearers into your doctrines, but you tell them reason has nothing to do with the matter! A fool would here have a decided advantage over a wise man.

Where do you learn, Dr. Cahill, that reason has nothing to do in religion? On what authority do you denounce the interference of the senses and reason which God has conferred upon man? Do you think it a crime to use the gifts we have

received at the hands of our Great Creator? According to your puny philosophy, man may use his reason about the things of this world, which, to him, shall last less than one hundred years; but he must not, on any account, exercise his reason in those matters which concern his destiny throughout the never-ending ages of eternity! Man's faculties transcend those of the beasts of the field in reference to this life; but you put them both on a par regarding futurity. Such is your philosophy. It is degrading enough.

"Remember," you say, "when we speak of God, *reason* is to be *abandoned*, *reason* is prostrate." This is mere assertion: I call for your proof. I grant there are many things regarding God which reason cannot fathom, because they are removed far beyond its sphere of action—they are out of its reach. But it does not follow from this that we are not to use our reason as far as it can go. Reason, like all the other intellectual faculties of man, has a certain definite range of action, and ought to be used within its own bounds. To deny this is to cast a stigma upon the works of the Creator. All the rational faculties He has conferred upon us ought to be used as far as He has commissioned them to extend, but no farther. Your principle seems to be that because reason cannot fathom God in every sense of the word, it must not be used regarding Him at all; because we cannot wade beyond our depth we must not venture into shallow water. Is it not ridiculous to say that, because we cannot comprehend the nature of God's essence, we are excluded from reasoning about His mercy, love, justice, and goodness? All these and similar things are excepted by you when you say we are to abandon reason when we speak of God, and also, that, in religion, reason has no part at all. Are you always consistent with your own principle? When you speak of matters relating to this life, do you refuse to reason about a thing when you cannot comprehend every iota concerning it? Do you understand everything, *or anything*, about the essence of light, heat, and electricity? If you do, you are more than human. To this amount of knowledge you would not even yourself pretend. Why, then, will you not act consistently, and prostrate reason regarding them altogether? When you cannot possibly understand everything about them, how does it come you had the hardihood to stand up and reason concerning them in your lecture in Derry? As long as a witness would testify everything in your favour, you would believe every word that would come out of his mouth; but the moment he says anything prejudicial to your cause, you would swear he was a perjured liar.

With your kind permission, Mr. Editor, I will resume the subject next week, when I hope to be able to prove to your readers that Dr. Cahill's reasoning powers are not so accurate, or so much to be relied upon, as some people seem to imagine.

Yours truly,

Coleraine, June 17th, 1853.

SECOND LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—Dr. Cahill says "*Reason is annihilated* when we look at the cradle of the Son of God. There is an infant, weak and helpless, yet that infant is the Almighty—finite yet infinite. Here we really believe only against our senses. Do you see the infinite God in the child Jesus in the cradle? No. Why do you not believe the eye now?" This statement may appear very plausible to an audience who have never been trained, or allowed, to think; but its extreme shallowness and ridiculous inconsistencies are at once patent to those whose reasoning powers are not stunted by inactivity. Suppose Dr. Cahill were to take an individual in whom the powers of reason were *totally* extinguished, or in other words, annihilated, by disease, or an individual on whom God never conferred the slightest trace of reasoning capacity, I ask, how would he teach that individual anything whatever about the infant, or the Almighty—about finity or infinity? How would he get him to believe either with or against the senses? Would his task not be a very hopeless one? And yet this individual would be quite as high in the scale of intellectual development as Dr. Cahill himself, if his reason were annihilated. What, then, are we to think of Popery, which demands reason to be "*abandoned*," to be "*prostrated*," to be "*annihilated*," when we turn to religion, or to God? Is not this a most degrading system of religion?—a system which makes man no better than the hippopotamus.

But how does it come that the contemplation of Jesus in

the cradle annihilates our reason? Is it not rather a subject which should give double energy to all our powers? Should it not brighten our hopes, and sharpen our understandings, rather than render us idiotic? Are there not many, very many things respecting that infant about which we can fairly and profitably reason? There may be, and are, some things here far *above* and *beyond* our reason, but most certainly there is nothing whatever *contrary* to it. This is the main distinction to keep before our minds. It is a distinction which will free us from all difficulties. A thing which is beyond the sphere of our reason *may* be true, *and should be believed on proper and sufficient evidence*; but a thing which is contrary to our reason *cannot* be true, and, therefore, could not be proved by *any* evidence; it could not be credited by any rational creature. In the very nature of things, an observed contradiction is within, not beyond, the compass of our reason, and, consequently, our reason is capable of judging in the matter. If two things are beyond our reason, we cannot say whether they contradict each other or not; they may or may not for aught we can tell. It is only when they come within the power of our reason we can see the contradiction and give our decision. Hence, it follows that a thing must be within the province of our reason before it can be contrary to it. We are always in a position to reject a contradiction, because the moment the contradiction appears, that moment it is within the power of our reason, and it must be rejected; it could not be supported by any evidence; it could not, after full investigation, be really believed by any sane individual. The public would certainly, and properly, consider a man deranged who would assert, and believe, that he was living in Ireland and Australia at the same instant of time. And why? Just because it is impossible for him to be in two places at one time. To assert the possibility of this is to contradict reason and common sense; and the man who believes it will be universally considered a lunatic. It would even be granted by Dr. Cabill himself. It is only in matters of religion he grants a patent for proving the sanity of a madman.

Does Dr. Cabill mean to say Jesus was infinite and almighty, *as a helpless infant*? If he does, and no other meaning would suit his purpose, then he reasons no better than a child wanting teeth. His opinion is absurd—it is contrary to reason—it could not possibly be correct. Jesus could not be infinite and finite in the same sense; He could not be almighty and helpless in the same point of view, any more than a man could reside in England and America at the very same

time. Such a thing would be so contrary to reason that a simpleton could hardly receive it. Instead of having our reason annihilated when we come to view the cradle of Jesus, let us summon up all the energies of our minds, and take a full and extended view of that unique individual who was both God and man. We shall then see that as man He was finite, as God He was infinite; as man He was helpless, as God He was almighty; as man He was visible, as God He was invisible. In place of being contradictory, this is all very rational. In place of forcing us to *abandon, prostrate, and annihilate* reason, this opens up an extensive field, of an interesting description, fitted for the contemplation of the most gigantic intellect that ever was conferred upon mortal man.

What do you mean, Dr. Cahill, when you say—"Here we really believe only against our senses?" Do you mean to say it is contrary to our senses of touch and of sight to believe that Jesus, when he lay in the cradle, was both God and man? These senses could very well take cognizance of His humanity; but they were not commissioned to directly discover His Godhead. Is any person foolish enough to imagine he *ought* to be able to see and feel the Godhead of Jesus?—You must surely have been raving when you uttered such sentiments. There is no contradiction from the senses in reference to the divinity and humanity of the infant in the cradle, except what arises from your own raving imagination. The sense of sight is a competent witness to bear direct testimony to the existence of the humanity of the Saviour, but it is not its province directly to discern His Godhead. Reason and sight, applied to the Scriptures, can discover that He was both God and man. You go farther and ask the question—"Do you see the infinite God in the child Jesus in the cradle?—No. Why do you not believe the eye now?" I must take the liberty of telling you, Dr. Cahill, this question is contemptible for its silliness. You are perfectly aware that the Godhead of Jesus is not visible to mortals, either in the cradle or out of it. You know very well that it does not throw the slightest discredit on our faith in the accuracy of sight, to say we cannot see a spirit—*one of the properties of which is to be invisible*. You are not ignorant of the fact that, if the Godhead of Jesus were visible to the human eye, it would not be a spirit at all, but matter—it would not be almighty, but weak—it would not be infinite, but finite—it would not be omnipresent, but confined to a particular locality. Why, then, do you ask such a ridiculous question? The eyes were commissioned by their creator to take cognizance of all visible ma-

terial objects; but they were never intended to see an invisible, immaterial, spirit. If you deny this the sooner you are in Bedlam the better. Why will you upbraid the eyes for not going beyond their province? When they tell the whole truth, as far as their knowledge extends, why will you refuse to believe them, and try to make them out liars, because they will not condescend to swear a falsehood for the purpose of suiting your theory? An honest witness will not please you. You are never satisfied unless he will perjure himself by swearing to the correctness of facts which, however true in themselves, and however capable of being proved by *a different evidence*, never could, by any possibility, come within *his* knowledge. The eye can prove that Jesus was man when he lay in the cradle. The existence of His divine nature we can satisfactorily establish by other evidence. No rational man would expect to see God with his eyes. If a man came up to any of us on the road, and told us he had just seen the Almighty, we would not have the slightest doubt, if we thought him in earnest, that he was a fit subject for the madhouse.

I cannot see any reason, Dr. Cahill, for your bringing forward such an argument, unless it be for the purpose of showing that you have as much right to expect us to see the Divinity in the cradle as we have to expect you to see the body of Jesus in the consecrated wafer. This, however, is a very lame and childish argument. The cases are not in the slightest degree parallel. Divinity is never visible to the eye, but humanity always is. The divinity of Jesus might be there without being seen—it could not be seen either there or anywhere else. The humanity of Jesus is essentially visible. It could not be either in the cradle or in the wafer without being discovered by the eye that will examine them. If his body is there it must be visible.

I will now test the correctness of Dr. Cahill's principle by applying it to a human being instead of Christ. Come here, Dr. Cahill, and take a look at this infant in the cradle.—There it is—mortal, yet immortal; visible, yet invisible; helpless, yet strong; material, yet immaterial. What do you think of it? Do you see its soul? Will you believe the eye now? "Well, I confess," the Doctor replies, "I think I do see something, but I fear my eyes are deceiving me. I cannot see its invisible, immaterial, immortal, soul, and, therefore, if I believe at all it must be against my senses. Sometimes I imagine I do get a glimpse of its body, but, then, again I am staggered even in this, because the moment I take a particular look at it my reason becomes annihilated. I cannot see

the spirit in the cradle, and, therefore, I must refuse to believe my eyes—they are not worthy of credit." Such is your mode of reasoning, Dr. Cahill, in reference to Christ. Are you not ashamed of your dwarfish understanding, or will you take the other alternative and acknowledge yourself a knowing impostor?

If you were at the side of the cradle of Jesus, Dr. Cahill, how would you know there was an infant in it at all? You will at once answer—"Do you think me a fool? Don't I see him plainly with my eyes, can't I handle him with my hands? Would any man but a madman deny he was there?" I admit, Dr. Cahill, your reasoning is very correct—it is unanswerable. But the insuperable mistake is, it entirely overthrows the doctrine of Transubstantiation. If we admit the accuracy of the senses of sight and of touch respecting the infant in the cradle, on what principle can we consistently refuse them credence when they testify regarding the wafer? Are they credible witnesses in the one case and perjured villains in the other? This would not be consistent either with religion or philosophy. When I look at the wafer, even after the consecration, I see plainly it is still a wafer; when I touch it, I feel it is still a wafer; when I taste it, I am sure it is bread; when I roast it on the fire, my nose says it is not flesh; when I lift it to the ceiling and let it fall on the floor, my ears swear most positively it is not a human body—it did not make a great noise, nor shake the floor to its centre. "I frankly admit," replies Dr. Cahill, "your reasoning puzzles me a good deal. Your doctrine is more easily believed than mine. But we must exercise faith, and deny every atom of sense God has given us. The Church contradicts the senses, and it must be right, no matter who may be wrong. The senses lead you all astray. You think you really see the wafer; but I tell you, and I am infallible, it is no wafer at all—it is the full-grown body of Christ. It is His flesh, blood, bones, nerves, soul, and divinity—whole and entire. It should not be the least obstacle to your belief that the priest might have some difficulty in swallowing this body. You forget that, after having fasted all morning, his throat is as capacious as that of the boa constrictor. Just take my advice; put no confidence in the senses. God spoiled them in the making. Your only safety is in following the Pope and his infallible Church."

I am, Sir, yours truly,

Coleraine, June 22d, 1853.

THIRD LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—Dr. Cahill says he rests the doctrine of Transubstantiation upon three portions of Scripture. He seems to think he has acted very heroically when he has gone to the Sacred Volume for the support of his opinions, and not to the fathers or councils. But, I would like to know, what is the use of attempting to prove the truth of this doctrine by a reference to Scripture. In reasoning with a man who denies the divine origin of the Bible, it is very necessary to be able to demonstrate that the Scriptures can be fairly interpreted, in accordance with the laws of language, without giving any support to such a monstrously absurd opinion. It is highly important, for the honour of Scripture, to be able to show that it can steer clear of such ridiculous nonsense. But it can serve no good purpose for Dr. Cahill, who professes to believe Revelation, to attempt to give a colouring to his trumpery, by an appeal to the Sacred Records. Take it for granted he can really prove that his doctrine is contained in the Bible, and that the inspired words can bear no other interpretation but his, without doing direct violence to the laws of language, and, I ask, what would be the consequence? Would this fact prove Transubstantiation to be true? Decidedly not. In place of that, it would incontestably prove the Scriptures to be a forgery. Transubstantiation is directly contrary to reason and common sense. It gives a flat contradiction to the senses of sight, touch, taste, hearing and smelling. Consequently it must of necessity be a lie; and as a direct consequence of this, the book which asserts its truth cannot possibly be from God. It is plain, then, it would be no advantage for Dr. Cahill to show it was a Scripture doctrine. If he could succeed in this, the Scriptures and it would both sink together.

Some people may think my statements too bold; but I am sure they are no stronger than they are true. I fearlessly state the truth, regardless of all consequences. It cannot be injured, if it is fairly represented. Suppose it were asserted, beyond doubt, in the Bible, that a man could be in the moon and on the surface of the earth at the same instant of time,

would any person believe it was true? Certainly not. *If he were ever so willing he could not do it.* His senses and judgment would revolt against it. Instead of taking the Scripture statement as a satisfactory evidence of the truth of the assertion, he would, without hesitation, take the assertion as an indisputable evidence that the book which contained it was a complete fable. So is it with Transubstantiation. It can be proved as clear as the light of heaven, that it is utterly impossible for it to have the slightest foundation in truth; and, as a matter of course, it must follow that the Bible is an invention of man, and not from God, *if it contains such a doctrine.* It would be of no use to establish the existence of this doctrine in Scripture, as it would be certain to sink the ship. But, on the other hand, it is a matter of overwhelming importance, to be able to show that the Scriptures do not necessarily support it. If we could not succeed in this, we could not establish the existence of a revelation from God at all.

In the beginning, God called the separate parts of creation into existence at separate and distinct periods of time.—As He was an infinitely wise Creator, we would naturally expect that every succeeding part would perfectly accord with those which preceded it in the order of development. Any deviation from this rule would have exhibited a want of knowledge and skill which would have been altogether inconsistent with the nature of God. He is allwise, and His works testify to the fact. The slightest consideration of the subject will convince us that man, who was created on the sixth day, after all other things had been finished, was formed in the most perfect accordance with everything which preceded and surrounded him. His lungs could receive atmospheric air without injury; his eyes were peculiarly adapted to the laws of light; his stomach was ready to digest food for the support of his system; he was able to walk on the surface of the earth in accordance with the laws of gravitation; his ears were formed for sound, his nose for smell, his palate for taste, and his fingers for touch. In short, in every sense of the word, he was created in the most delightful harmony with those things which preceded him in the order of the universe. Such things should convince us that God is not like man. There is no jarring or bungling in His works; they are all most admirably adapted to each other.

Now, I ask, is it rational to suppose that God, who has displayed such extraordinary wisdom in the creation of the world, would make the grossest blunders imaginable in revealing His will to man? Could it, for a moment, be supposed He would

send us a written revelation without having previously conferred upon us trustworthy senses by which we would be enabled to judge of it, and appropriate it to our use? More especially, is it possible He could have given us a revelation containing doctrines which are completely opposed, and directly contrary, to all the senses and intellect He had previously bestowed upon the human race? Such a thing is not to be credited. If it were the case, the great work of revelation would be radically defective, and not, for one instant, to be compared, in point of perfection, to the far less important work of creation. Man's future destiny would thus be much more carelessly provided for than his present temporary condition. This may suit the deluded followers of Rome; but it is altogether inconsistent with the accurate adaptations of our infallible Creator.

As God prepared the world for the reception of man before man was called into existence, and as the system of man was made to harmonize most completely with the previous stages of creation, even so did God endow man with faculties fitted for the reception of revelation before that revelation was written; and as that revelation comes from God it must be peculiarly adapted to man's condition previous to its reception. Let it also be particularly observed that all the change upon man, effected by the fall, had taken place long before the Bible was received, consequently the Bible must be suited to man in his present condition. If God is perfect His written Word cannot contradict the senses and reason which humanity received at the hands of our Creator long before the Scriptures were given. There can be no jarring between the testimony of these two heavenly messengers. So far as they are commissioned to testify, they must agree upon every point, otherwise they would have no claim to a heavenly origin. Our senses and intellect are first in the order of existence, and consequently have the first claim. Everything which comes after them, the Scriptures not excepted, must harmonize with their decisions.

God endowed man with reason, and the senses of sight, touch, taste, hearing, and smelling, all of which connect man with the external world. It is through them *alone* information can be gathered either from the field of nature or the book of revelation. To charge them as false witnesses, as the Papists do, is to cast a stigma upon the author of their existence. They were in being long before the Bible was written, consequently, everything contained in Scripture must be in harmony with their dictates. Nothing can be true which contradicts them. It is only by their means we can be made

aware of *the existence of God or the Bible*. They are the only channels through which information can be carried. If they are not to be trusted where is the use of a revelation? When God has sent us a revelation, is it not an insult to Him to affirm that the senses through which *He has obliged* us to receive it must of necessity lead us astray? If our senses and understandings are as far deranged as Papists would have us believe, we are a regular set of maniacs. But, oh! it is an awful thing to charge God with giving us senses calculated to lead us astray regarding a revelation by which we are to be tested at the great and final day. Human nature has fallen from its pristine dignity; but our senses, if in health, are still the unerring dicta of God to our thinking principle. By an inherent law of our nature we cannot avoid giving implicit credence to what they testify.

Dr. Cahill may despise the senses as he pleases, but I affirm he cannot proceed one step in *any direction* without their assistance. If he will take a person who, from his birth, has always been blind, without taste, smell, hearing, and touch, and will teach him anything whatever about God or the devil, heaven or hell, or even the infallible Church, I will give up the whole question. It is through these senses alone, which Popery despises, we get our knowledge from without, and the man who refuses to believe them, provided they are in a healthy condition, is himself a lunatic. He is not fit to be reasoned with. In order to throw discredit on the testimony of the senses, it is a common thing with Papists to deny their accuracy. But this is very foolish, because, if they are inaccurate about transubstantiation, *they are equally incapable of judging about the infallible Church*. They could not even tell of its existence. If they cannot give an honest testimony in the one case, they are not trustworthy witnesses in the other. By invalidating their testimony, the Papist, if he would only think of it, might see that he is cutting his own throat. He renders it impossible for us to know there is such a thing in existence as a Pope, a Priest, or an infallible Church.

So long as we retain the use of our reason and senses, we could not possibly believe that the entire and full-grown body of Christ is in the wafer, whilst it still, to all our senses, remains a wafer. The man who, through religious fanaticism, believes this, is proved to be a madman by every argument which could consign him to Bedlam. He cannot be reasoned with, for he has already trampled on all the rational grounds of belief. He can only be lashed with ridicule, and held up

as a laughing-stock to society. He will not credit his senses. He may comfort himself, however, with the reflection, that, in this respect, he is following the example of some men who, in their day, stood on the very top of philosophical eminence. David Hume and Bishop Berkeley occupied a prominent position in those days of pseudo-philosophy. They denied they had any proof of the existence of the material world, or of anything in it beyond themselves. They would not believe their senses. They tried to reason themselves clean out of their judgment, and they succeeded. For a time their followers were innumerable. Did this make them right? Would any of my readers think a man sane who would deny there was any proof of the existence of matter? Certainly not. The existence of the world is a palpable fact to every one who has the use of his senses. He is impelled, by a first principle of his nature, to believe it. He receives it as a necessary fact, and no argument can add to its credibility. I have heard it said Bishop Berkeley was once put to the *practical test* on this matter. He went to call at the house of a friend, but during his walk there came on a tremendous shower of rain. In a few minutes he was wet nearly to the skin. His friend observed him coming up the avenue, and told the servant not to open the door. The Bishop, in his hurry, gave a great knock at the door, and his friend, very good naturedly, put his head out of the drawing-room window and told him to walk in. "I cannot get in," says the Bishop, "for the door is shut." His friend at once replied, "you are all mistaken, there is no door there; you only imagine it; there is no proof of the existence of matter in the whole world. Just walk in out of the rain." This might have taught the Bishop a lesson about the absurdity of denying his senses. It was like the practical test to which I put Dr. Cahill. There was no way of getting out of it. Dr. Cahill has not the manliness to face it, nor yet to acknowledge he is wrong.

Let us suppose a stranger comes into the Diamond of Coleraine, and we ask him what he thinks of the Town-hall, which occupies its centre. He replies, "what do you mean about the Town-hall? There is no such building in the Diamond. You only imagine it. I can prove to you by the arguments used by David Hume, Bishop Berkeley, and Dr. Cahill, that there is no evidence of the existence of the Town-hall. It is not there at all. You may look at it and think you see it, you may touch it and think you feel it, but it is all imagination. These senses are not to be depended on.

They lead you astray. I belong to an infallible church, and I tell you, you are all wrong. My word is twice as good as your senses." If he reasoned in this way, would any one in the town believe him? If they thought him in earnest, would they not confidently swear he was deranged? Most undoubtedly they would, and correctly too. I also maintain, if he were put to *the practical test*, it would bring him to a stand-still in his religio-philosophical balderdash. If he would allow me to strike his head half a dozen times against the wall of the Town-hall, I would convince him of his folly. I would soon bring him to his eyesight.

It is a most extraordinary thing that men can believe their senses about the existence of the material world, and yet refuse to believe the *same senses* about the wafer. If these senses swear falsely regarding the wafer, are they credible witnesses in any other case whatever? Common sense will certainly say, no.

I am, Mr. Editor, yours truly,
Coleraine, July 1st, 1853.

FOURTH LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—As I am quite confident the Scriptures come from God and must be true, I am not afraid to measure swords with Dr. Cahill over them in regard to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. I am certain they will not prove against me. This heavenly witness cannot contradict its predecessors, reason and common sense. At the outset, however, I must guard against a misapprehension into which thousands have fallen in respect to the party upon whom *the duty of proof* lies. Serious mistakes are constantly happening upon this head—sometimes through ignorance, and very frequently from design. On every question, the man who holds the *affirmative* is bound to prove his case. The simple enunciation of this rule ought to be sufficient to establish its accuracy. The plaintiff must satisfy the court as to the validity of his case before the defendant is required to produce a single witness. In the present instance, Dr. Cahill main-

tains the truth of Transubstantiation, I deny it. He holds the affirmative, I hold the negative. He is the plaintiff, I am the defendant. It consequently falls to his lot to prove that the Scriptures unequivocally contain his doctrine. As the defender of the Bible, I have only to shout innocent, innocent, till he satisfies the jury of my guilt. If his witnesses give such evidence as might fairly be interpreted either for or against me, the one way as readily as the other, then it is plain the case is to be thrown aside. Nay more, I could not be condemned by an honest jury unless the evidence is of such a nature as to make my guilt certain. It must be such that I could not make it bear any other fair construction but for my condemnation. Now, as Dr. Cahill holds that Transubstantiation is a Scriptural doctrine, he is plainly bound to prove not only that the words of Scripture appear to favour it, but also that they cannot be interpreted in any other sense without doing direct violence to the laws of language. If they can possibly bear a fair construction on the other side, the doctrine certainly is not proved—the prisoner is not made guilty. This holds good more particularly, inasmuch as the doctrine in question is so directly contrary to reason and common sense that it could not be true, even if it were contained in the Bible. Under these circumstances, before the Scriptures are thrown overboard as a forgery, Dr. Cahill is bound to show that, beyond all controversy, they contain his doctrine.

The more improbable an opinion is, the greater the amount of evidence we require to support it. This principle is recognized every day. The higher a man's morality is known to be, the more difficult will we find it to convince a jury of his neighbours that he is a thief or a murderer. Again, it would take a most extraordinary amount of evidence to prove that extremely improbable doctrine in mesmerism, called clairvoyance, which maintains that a person can see direct through the earth from Ireland to Australia as easily as he can see through a glass window. The possession of this power is so very unlike the truth that it would require to be supported by an overwhelming amount of incontrovertible evidence before we would be warranted in believing it. So is it with regard to the proof of the Scriptures containing the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It is utterly impossible for the book which contains this doctrine to be true. We must, therefore, be absolutely certain that the Scriptures undertake to prove it in the most decided and unequivocal manner before we record a verdict against them. The evidence must

be reviewed with the most extraordinary care before we sign the warrant which seals their doom ; it must be of such a nature that there is no possibility of escape. If the Scriptures contained this doctrine we would be justified in rejecting them as the greatest deceivers that ever were imposed upon the human race.

Having premised thus much, I proceed to the consideration of Dr. Cahill's Scriptural arguments.

"I refer you," says Dr. Cahill, "to the sixth chapter of St. John, from the 48th to the 58th verse inclusive. You will observe the bread spoken of here is not natural bread—'the bread which I will give,' says Christ, '*is my flesh.*' When he says, 'verily, verily, except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood,' he means that they should eat a *reality*, not a *metaphor*, drink a *reality*, not a *figure*. Our Lord speaks of eating and drinking a *reality*, not of eating and drinking a *spirit* or a *figure*." From this it is quite evident that Dr. Cahill is entirely wanting either in perspicacity or in honesty. When he speaks of eating a reality, not a spirit, drinking a reality, not a figure, he is deceiving himself with an absurdity, or else he is intentionally misleading his audience. He makes *the act of eating and drinking* literal, and *the thing to be eaten and drunk* spiritual or figurative. Having thus, out of his own head, created a ridiculous object, he is exceedingly valiant in exposing its incongruities. Did any Protestant ever imagine he could *literally* eat a spirit and drink a figure? We do not trample on common sense after Dr. Cahill's fashion. We *literally* eat and drink a tangible object, and we *spiritually* eat and drink a spiritual object. When the one is literal, so is the other; when the one is spiritual, so is the other. In this respect, the *act* and the *object* must perfectly correspond. As bread is the literal support of the body, so is Christ the spiritual food for the soul. "I am the bread of life," says Jesus, "he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." As it is here plainly set forth that the hunger shall *never return*, it *must* be that the *hunger* itself, and the *bread* which satisfies it, are both spiritual. The food which we eat in this life does not satisfy the bodily appetite in such a way as that the hunger never returns. When Christ, then, says he is the bread of life, he cannot possibly mean he is literally bread. He is bread only in a spiritual and figurative sense. I will receive Dr. Cahill's version of this affair if he will *fast* for twelve months after swallowing the wafer and drinking the wine.

I suspect he would not like to be held up to his literal interpretation of the sixth chapter of John, and kept upon short allowance after swallowing the Eucharist.

Suppose, it was said, a gentleman in Coleraine *devoured and drank* every word of Dr. Cahill's discourse, would a mere child misunderstand the meaning of the expression? Would any person, above an idiot, infer from this that it was really possible to *masticate* and *swallow words*? Would he think that the words were chewed, swallowed, and passed into the stomach? No. He would have no difficulty in understanding the meaning of this very common form of expression. In place of taking it *literally*, after Dr. Cahill's plan, he would understand the whole in a *figurative* sense, as importing that the man had paid great attention to the sermon, and had mentally swallowed, or received, every word of it as true. What difficulty is there, then, in understanding how we can, in a figurative sense, eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ? None. It is plain to every person who is not sunk in stupidity or ignorance.

If the eating of the flesh and the *drinking of the blood* of the Son of Man are to be understood in a literal, and not in a figurative sense, what is the consequence? Simply this, all the *laity* in the Church of Rome are to be damned! "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man," says the Scripture, "and drink his blood, ye have *no life* in you"—you are spiritually dead. Dr. Cahill maintains that the eating and drinking are to be taken literally. Why, then, does he refuse to allow the *laity* to *drink* the cup? What is the reason for letting them all go to hell? Is there no person to be saved but the Priest, the Friar, or the silly old man, the Pope? On his own representation, Dr. Cahill is a cruel monster. He says "observe again, a threat of damnation pronounced unless ye eat—eat what? Bread? No, but 'the flesh of the Son of Man.' Except ye eat this you are lost; except ye take it, damnation. Eat it, salvation. He says 'verily, verily.' Two oaths this; as much as if he had said, 'I swear *twice* that except ye eat my flesh and *drink* my blood there is no salvation for you.'" Now, Dr. Cahill, if it be true, as you say, that there is no salvation for any person who does not eat the flesh and *drink the blood* of the Son of Man, in the plain, literal sense of the term, what excuse on earth could you make for withholding the *cup* from the *laity*? Are they not, every one, on your own showing, consigned to perdition? and that, too, under circumstances which you could, without any difficulty, obviate. Surely you

are a prodigious monster in the human form. If you had the slightest feeling of compassion for your fellow man, you would go about night and day, handing the *cup* to every person in your church you could induce to take it. It will not do to say the blood is in the wafer, because as long as the wafer is swallowed whole there can be no separation of the blood. There can be no LITERAL DRINKING, and consequently no salvation. The drinking is mentioned as separately, as literally, and as distinctly as what the eating is. You will not allow the laity to drink the blood of Christ, and consequently you refuse them salvation. I believe you will not even allow them to masticate the wafer. How, then, could they drink the blood even if it were in it? In place of either sucking, chewing, or drinking, they must swallow the wafer whole, something after the fashion of a pelican swallowing a fish.

A new view of this passage of Scripture has just this moment occurred to my mind. Jesus says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you.*" Now, if Dr. Cahill has a right to interpret the first part of this sentence literally, I have an equal right to do the same with the last. There could be no reason assigned for making the one clause literal and the other figurative. They must both be the same—either literal or figurative. If the eating and drinking are literal, in this instance, it must be true that the man who fails to do both has *literally no life in him*. That is to say, he has no natural, literal life in him. He must be dead—dead literally, not figuratively—as dead as mutton. If the eating and drinking are literal, so is the death, and if the death is figurative, so must the eating and drinking. They must both be interpreted on the same principle. Nothing else would be consistent. According to Dr. Cahill's view, the eating and drinking are literal, consequently *every man* who has failed to do both is absolutely and literally dead. There is not a *living* individual in the whole Protestant world, because they have not either eaten or drunk of the flesh or blood. Nor are any of the Roman Catholic laity alive either, because they have not been permitted to drink of the blood. It is the "whole world against a China orange" in favour of the priests, to whom the drinking is confined. This is a desolating view of the case, but it is a true one. Dr. Cahill has, with one fell swoop, sent nearly all the inhabitants of the earth to a premature grave. From this he cannot possibly escape. Jesus says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, YE HAVE NO LIFE IN

rou." I am now fairly entitled to ask my readers, do they consider Dr. Cahill's explanation half so rational as the one entertained by Protestants, which teaches us that we eat and drink spiritually, not literally, and that the life spoken of is the spiritual life, and not the life of the flesh?

Again, if the eating and drinking referred to by Christ were literal, it would confine life, whether temporal or eternal, to those who were in existence at the time he was upon earth. During His earthly career it was within the bounds of possibility for His cotemporaries to have eaten His flesh and drunk His blood. But the thing is now utterly impossible. No man can literally eat him at present, and, therefore, according to this view, no man could now be saved either temporally or eternally.

I ask you, Dr. Cahill, if you thought you were really and literally eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ in the Mass, could you do it? could you swallow it? would it not turn your stomach? It would go hard with you to eat the raw flesh and drink the raw blood of a sheep, but it would surely be far worse to eat the entire flesh and drink the entire blood of the humanity of Christ. Verily if your stomach can literally receive and retain the whole body and blood of Jesus, you are the most voracious cannibal I ever heard of. There never was a match for you in the Islands of Feejee!

"I am the living bread," says Jesus at the 51st verse, "which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I shall give is my flesh." Here it is said that this bread which he calls his flesh came down from heaven. If this means the *literal* flesh, it follows that Christ's body, in place of being born of the Virgin, came down from heaven. How will this literal interpretation of your's, Dr. Cahill, do with the honour you pay to the Virgin Mary? If the flesh literally came down from heaven, she is not his mother, and all the respect, or rather worship, you pay to her is in vain. Again, "If any man eat of this bread, *he shall live for ever.*" Now, if the eating be literal, the living for ever must be literal too. Whatever the one is the other is. If you are right in the *literal* interpretation, I must have one of your wafers for myself. The man who swallows a wafer of this description is a fortunate fellow. He will live far longer than Methuselah; he will never leave this world. He would be a first-rate life to put in a lease. No man could reasonably ask to live longer than for ever. You would like, Dr. Cahill, to interpret the eating in a literal, and the living in a spiritual sense, but this would

be altogether unwarrantable. It would not serve you much even if we were to allow you this license. Let us see. Every one who has literally eaten Christ, that is, swallowed your wafer, must spiritually live for ever—must be saved eternally. In this view, there could be no apostacy from your church. No one could ever leave your church after swallowing a wafer. It hooks them as securely as if they were rivetted to it. Or else you must admit, contrary to the doctrine of your church, that those individuals who got a wafer and afterwards turned to Protestantism, are actually saved eternally. I do not think either of these views would keep you out of trouble. Turn where you will you are in a dilemma.

Christ says at the 55th verse, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." If this is to be interpreted literally and not figuratively, and if the wafer contains the entire body and blood of Christ, then it is plain that the wafer is both meat and drink, it would perfectly satisfy hunger and thirst, and support the body. There would be no need of ordinary food so long as the wafers were to be had. The priests ought to have manufactured them very extensively during the year of the famine, to keep their proverbially impoverished followers from dying with hunger. "He that eateth me," says Christ, "even he shall live by me." If this is literal and Christ is in the wafer, there is no need whatever for ordinary food.

The greatest misfortune of all, Dr. Cahill, is that Christ says at the 63d verse, "The flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." This is a settler for you. Leaving the impossibility of a literal interpretation of the previous parts of the chapter out of the question, Jesus here shows us plainly that he meant it all in a spiritual sense. Pray, how does it come the latter part of this quotation escaped your observation? It did not suit your purpose to see it. It is a shame for you to close your eyes against the truth. I fear you have followed the example of Nelson at the battle of Copenhagen, and have put the telescope to the blind eye.

I am, Mr. Editor, yours truly,
Coleraine, July 7th, 1853.

FIFTH LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—In the course of his observations on the sixth chapter of John, Dr. Cahill says to his hearers, "when you go home take the Scriptures, and read the words, and I think you will admit that *they look very like Catholic doctrine.*" What sort of proof is this? Is this the loose way in which the sacred oracles are to be interpreted? Would any person but a Papist be satisfied with such a method of settling those momentous and vital questions which are contained in the sixth of John? Is a man to hang the concerns of his immortal soul upon an interpretation which has nothing for its groundwork but mere resemblance? It is wonderful, almost incredible, how easily people are satisfied in matters of religion—more especially if the opinions inculcated are in accordance with their preconceived ideas and early prejudices. To gull them in worldly affairs, would be found a very different and far more arduous undertaking. In these things, they are all wide awake. Suppose Dr. Cahill and I had each a flock of sheep, and that fifty of mine had either strayed or been stolen. When I set out on the search for the lost sheep, I discover Dr. Cahill's fold. I immediately look through and pick out fifty which I claim as my own. Dr. Cahill objects, and says I am mistaken, they are not mine but his. I at once reply, they *must* be mine. *for they look very like my sheep.* Would any argument of this description satisfy the Doctor, or would a jury hand them over to me on such conditions? No. I would be obliged to swear most positively that they were mine, and that, in consequence of certain marks and tokens, I had no doubt of their identity. I am sure Dr. Cahill would not consider *likeness* a sufficient proof of the identity of sheep; but he thinks it an argument of great importance in a matter which, on his own showing, is essential to salvation. This is consistency for you.

You direct your hearers, Dr. Cahill, when they go home to read the words of Scripture. How can you reconcile this advice, with the denunciations of your church against the use of private judgment? For what purpose are they to read them, if they are not allowed to think for themselves? You are very childish in this instance in exposing your inconsistencies; or

else the boasted unity of your church is shown to be a vision by the fact that one party can tell the laity to read the Bible, and another can denounce their conduct for so doing. Apart from this, however, I ask, how are the laity to know that they are reading the words of Scripture, or that there is such a book in existence as the Bible? They have already refused to believe their eyes and their ears about the wafer, and you surely could not ask them to credit the same witnesses about the words of Scripture, whether they may read them or hear of them. If these witnesses have perjured themselves in the one case, they are not to be trusted in the other. They are such tricky boys that they require to be well watched. They will make a desperate effort to deceive the people. It is inconsistent, Dr Cahill, with your principles, if you have any, to use your eyes at all.

It is not possible, Dr. Cahill, you could be serious in advising your hearers when they go home to read the Scriptures. You know right well it is all a mockery. How are they to read the Scriptures when they are not permitted the use even of the Douay version of them in their houses? Can they read a book which is not in their possession? It is as great a mockery to tell Roman Catholics to read their Bibles when they go home as it would be to advise a starving man to eat and make himself comfortable at a time when there was no food within his reach. We all know you like to keep your followers in the most degraded ignorance, but if, under particular circumstances, reading of some kind is unavoidable, you would allow them to read anything rather than the Bible. Of all books in the world, it is the one you dread the most, because you know the reading of it would soon open the eyes of the people to the abominations of your church. Is it not stated in the Bull Unigenitus that it is "*false, scandalous, impious, blasphemous,*" to say that the reading of the Scriptures is for all men? And yet you take on you to tell your hearers when they go home to read the words of Scripture. How are the people to decide between two such authorities? Which of these two *infallible* authorities are they to follow, seeing that the one is diametrically opposed to the other?—More especially, how can such a difference be reconciled with the *infallibility* and the boasted *unity* of your church?

Dr. Cahill's great anxiety in urging his hearers to read the words of Scripture when they would go home brings to my recollection the conduct of the priest who regularly officiates in the chapel in which he was then preaching. During the memorable year of the Irish famine—memorable to the loyal,

peaceable, industrious, and exemplary Protestants of Ulster, who, after having, by the most untiring efforts, and by the outlay of large sums of money, done more than their part in assisting to support the poor of all denominations in their own province,* were taxed by an unprincipled parliament, in the way of a rate-in-aid, for the maintenance of the Papists in the south and west of Ireland, who were dying of starvation *because* they had spent the time which should have been occupied in the acts of peaceful industry, in promoting political agitation, religious intolerance, disloyalty, bloodshed, and murder—in that memorable year, I say, Priest Flanagan attended the soup committees and appeared as modest, as gentle, and as amiable as a lady. All of a sudden, however, a *private* letter of his to a friend in England, by some accident or other, came to light, and was published in the *Tablet*. A few extracts from this letter will show that Dr. Cahill's and Priest Flanagan's views about the reading of the Bible will not tally. He says there is "an infinite staff of elders, *Bible-readers* and *Biblical-ladies*, &c., who are in perpetual motion, positively tripping each other in their *satanic* zeal to catch souls. * * Notwithstanding all the appliances earth and hell could bring to bear on them, I have not lost one. * * * How I tremble * * * when I see these emissaries creeping into their cabins at all hours, carrying free soup-tickets, blankets, and body-clothes, and offering *Bibles* and tracts * * * All *hell* seems let loose in the varied forms of tickets, and tracts, and blankets, and *Bibles*. May the strong God confound his enemies." It would not be easy to reconcile Dr. Cahill's directions about the reading of the Scriptures at home with the contents of this letter of the modest Priest Flanagan. The first pretended that he wished them to read the words of Scripture, the last spoke the truth of his mind freely and frankly. They have all a heart-hatred for the Bible. It is no excuse to say they only object to the Protestant version, because *in practice* it is found that they do not circulate any version whatever amongst their people.

Dr. Cahill assumed, but never attempted to prove, that the

* It is our bounden duty to contribute according to our means towards the maintenance of those who are prevented from earning their support by reason of natural inability, old age, or any bodily or mental—as it is improperly called—disease, which has overtaken them in the course of God's Providence; but it by no means follows from this that we ought to hold out a *direct bribe and inducement* to crime, by paying for the support of those who spend their time in idleness, debauchery, drunkenness, and all sorts of vice. "This we *commanded* you," says the apostle Paul, "that if any would not work, neither should he eat."

sixth chapter of John refers to the Eucharist. Assumption here is very easy—proof is impossible. As he has not adduced the slightest particle of evidence, but has merely taken the thing for granted, I will content myself by simply entering my decided protest, and proceed without further delay to his second scriptural argument, taken from the 26th, 27th, and 28th verses of the 26th chapter of Matthew. "Observe here," says he, "Our Lord says 'this is'—what? Bread? No. But 'my body.' 'This is'—what? Wine? No. But 'my blood.' The blood of a spirit! the blood of bread! the blood of wine! the blood of a figure! the blood of a memorial! Is this his meaning? This is downright nonsense. The words of Scripture you see clearly annihilate their doctrine." You are quite correct, Dr. Cahill, in saying that this is "downright nonsense," but you should have stated at the same time that the nonsense is all your own. Your followers have obtained a patent from head quarters for believing nonsense; but Protestants yield to reason alone. I am sorry to find that your brain must be miserably developed either in the moral or intellectual region. You are either bordering on simplicity or your organ of conscientiousness is below par.—If you have any sense, you must know that Protestants do not believe there is blood in bread, in wine, in a spirit, or in a figure; and, what is more to the purpose, that this opinion *could not by any possibility whatever result from their interpretation of the passages of Scripture in question.* You get over the matter as lightly and as quickly as possible, and you do not even *attempt* to show that such a result is fairly deducible from our doctrines. You have again fallen into the palpable error which I referred to in my last letter of jumbling together the literal and the figurative where they are as distinct as they could possibly be made. It is a wonder you are not ashamed of yourself on account of the frequent repetition of this blunder which appears in your sermon. It would disgrace a child of five years of age. I confess it requires all the charity I can muster to believe that you did not intend by these means to blindfold and deceive your audience.

The words of Scripture relating to the Lord's Supper, are so plain that no person but a drivelling idiot could misunderstand them. "Jesus took bread, and blessed it," (the bread) "and brake it," (the bread) "and gave it" (the bread) "to the disciples, and said, take, eat," (eat it, the bread.) "This" (bread) "is my body." Here it is as evident as words can make it, that it continues to be bread after it is blessed, after it is broken, after it was given to the disciples, and after they

were desired to eat. Nay, more, it still continues to be bread at the very time he says it is his body. This what is my body? This bread is my body. This *literal* bread represents *in figure* the body of Christ. We literally eat literal bread, and through it, in a figurative sense, we spiritually feed upon Christ. Can anything be plainer than this? Would any person but a fool imagine that Christ told them to eat himself, or that it was possible for him to hold his own body in his hand? The experience of every day furnishes us with abundant illustrations of perfectly similar phraseology, and I never knew of any man mistaking their meaning. They never think of taking them in any other than a figurative sense. I walked into an auction mart, one evening, in Coleraine. The auctioneer was a *papist*. He was preparing to sell a figure of the Duke of Wellington sitting in a chair. "This, gentlemen," said he, "is the Duke of Wellington in the chair in which he died; please set it up for me." Did this Roman Catholic auctioneer, or did any of his hearers misunderstand the phrase? Did he imagine it was the real body of the Duke of Wellington, and the real chair in which he died he held in his hand, or did any of his hearers fall into this mistake? I rather think not. And yet he said as plain as words could make it, *this is the Duke of Wellington*. If we instantly understand the words of the auctioneer in a figurative, and could not be made believe them in any other, sense, why will we be so perverse as to misunderstand *the very same form* of expression, when we find it in the words of Christ? The auctioneer took the piece of China in his hand and said, "this is the Duke of Wellington;" Christ took a piece of bread in his hand and said, "this is my body." Are the phrases not perfectly similar, and are they not equally intelligible? Would any child in Coleraine misunderstand them? When lecturing on phrenology in Coleraine and in Dublin, I often put my hand upon a cast of the head of Rammohun Roy saying, *this is the head of Rammohun Roy*, and you see it is very deficient in the organ of veneration; but I never found any person, either Papist or Protestant, misunderstanding my words. They never once imagined, when I said *this is the head* of Rammohun Roy, that I had *his real head* upon the table. I am sure such a notion never occurred to them. In place of taking my words *literally*, they understood them in a figurative sense. Why, then, are we to act this way in regard to our own words, and at the same time refuse to do the same justice to the words of our Saviour? When He uses a form of expression which has a perfectly rational and obvious meaning, why are we to under-

stand them in a sense which would overturn the Bible, and prostrate the intellect, and contradict all the senses which God has bestowed on the human race?

"Christ says to the Jews, 'Destroy this temple,' meaning his body. Did his body," says my father, "by these words become really a temple? Why, then, shall the words, 'this is my body,' make bread flesh? 'I am the true vine.' Was Christ literally a vine? 'I am the door.' Was he literally a door? The Church is called *his body*; is it literally so? The Church is said to be *one bread* and *one body*; is it literally one loaf; is it literally a body? Christians are said to be born again; are they so literally? Could a child understand these in any other sense than that one thing was a representation of another? There would be no end to illustrations of so common and obvious a figure. Nothing but the blindness of the most perverse prejudice could require illustration of a form of speech known and used by all men. Stygian darkness alone can cover it from the sight of any who can muster courage to shake off authority and think as a man. Christ says, 'I am the bread of life.' Did Christ's body at that time become bread? Why, then, should the bread that he called his body become flesh? If his body was in one sense bread, while it really continued flesh, why might not bread be his body in a like sense while it continued really bread? The very same criticism that makes the bread become his flesh will make his body become literally bread. How would the world laugh if some frantic enthusiast would start up and say, 'I maintain from the words, *I am the bread of life*, that Jesus Christ at that moment became a loaf—that the whole substance of his flesh, blood, and bones, was transubstantiated into the substance of bakers' bread, and that there remained in him not a particle of flesh, blood, or bone—that though he continued to have all the accidents and attributes of a man, yet these attributes existed without a subject; and with thought and animal life, there was no principle of thinking nor living being—though he appeared to continue a living, rational, animal being, in reality he was a lump of bread, possessing neither life, nor soul, nor human body?' Is this extravagant? Is this the raving of madness? Is this the sublimity of nonsense? It is twin-sister to Transubstantiation."

Yours truly.

Coleraine, July 12th, 1853.

SIXTH LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—I concluded my last letter with a criticism on the 26th verse of the 26th chapter of Matthew's Gospel; and I have now to consider the 27th and 28th verses, which were also quoted by Dr. Cahill. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it" (the cup) "to them, saying, drink ye all of it" (the cup.) "For this" (cup) "is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." No words could make this plainer than it is. It is quite evident that the wine, contained in the cup, was unchanged from first to last. Literally it was wine, but figuratively it was blood. The wine was an exceedingly appropriate emblem, or figure, of the blood of Christ. When we literally drink this wine, we can, by faith, spiritually drink the blood of Christ. The one emblematically, or figuratively, represents the other. Nothing can be more easily understood than this. Dr. Cahill may rave as he likes about "the blood of a spirit, the blood of wine, and the blood of a figure;" but he cannot even attempt, and has not attempted, to demonstrate that our language is chargeable with such nonsense. To say the blood of a spirit, the blood of wine, and the blood of a figure, is a widely different thing from saying that the wine is a figurative representation of the blood of Christ, and that our drinking literally of the wine is an emblem, or figure, of our drinking spiritually of the blood of our Saviour. The first is perfect balderdash, the second is consistent with simple, plain, common sense.

It would have been very satisfactory if Dr. Cahill had given us his reason for ending his quotation here with the 28th verse. Did the 29th verse escape his observation; or was he dishonest enough to pass it by because it could not be reconciled with his views. If he were half a man he would face it fairly. "But I say unto you," says Jesus, at the 29th verse, "I will not drink henceforth of *this fruit of the vine*, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." What can Dr. Cahill say to this? Does this not plainly prove that it was as much wine after the blessing as before it? Without any further argument this is sufficient to settle the whole question. Observe, He does not say *the*

fruit of the vine, but *this* fruit of the vine. This fruit of the vine, then, is the identical thing which he had previously called blood. He took the *cup*, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it, for *this* is my blood of the New Testament; but I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of *this* fruit of the vine, &c. Surely this is so plain as to render any further comment unnecessary. Still I will turn up another view of the passage, which, so far as I am aware, has not occurred to Dr. Cahill or any other person. If the Roman Catholics are correct in adopting the literal, and excluding the figurative, interpretation of this portion of Scripture, there would be a double transmutation. The cup is first converted into blood, and that blood is immediately after converted into the fruit of the vine. This result is unavoidable. In the 28th verse he calls the cup his blood, and in the 29th verse he says it is the fruit of the vine. If Dr. Cahill is to take the one part literally, I have an equal right to do the same with the other. If, then, the cup is really Christ's blood, Christ's blood is really the fruit of the vine. How does the matter stand now? Why, simply thus: if the figurative interpretation is to be excluded, and the literal adopted, they are neither drinking wine nor blood, but a bundle of grapes—the fruit of the vine. Where will the inconsistencies of Rome end? It will not relieve them in the slightest degree to say that the disciples were desired to drink it before it was called the fruit of the vine, because they were desired to drink it before it was called blood. If this objection could possibly hold in the one case, it would equally hold in the other. I am very much mistaken if I have not placed them in a position from which they cannot escape.

Dr. Cahill's third and last Scriptural argument is founded on the 23d, 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th verses of the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians. "The Lord Jesus," says he, "took bread, and said, 'this is'—bread? No. But 'My body.' The body of bread! The body of wine! Nonsense." Dr. Cahill must have been raving when he made this statement. He is here fighting against a shadow. No person imagines that Jesus said, "This is bread;" but he said very plainly this bread is my body. He did not call the bread bread, but he called the bread his body. This, surely, is very different from saying "the body of bread, the body of wine." Is it not very plain now, that the "nonsense" is all in Dr. Cahill's own brain? We read "that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, *and when he had given thanks, he brake it*" (the bread) "*and said, take*

eat ; this " (bread) " is my body, which is broken for you." Now, let us look at this for a little. Jesus took bread, and after, not before, he had given thanks, he brake it. What did he break ? Was it his own body he broke ? No, but the bread. What does he mean when he says, " this is my body ?" What is it he calls his body ? Evidently the bread which he held in his hand. This bread is my body, not this body is my body. If the blessing has anything to do with the Transubstantiation the change has already taken place, and, instead of saying this bread is my body, Christ should have said this body of mine is my body. Surely this would throw great light on the subject !

There can be no difficulty in understanding what Christ means when he says this bread is my body. This real bread which I now hold in my hand is an emblem or figure of my body which is broken for you. This is very easily comprehended. Such figurative form of expression is in daily use, and it presents no obstacle to the understanding of a child. If Dr. Cahill went to the Post-office and asked for a Queen's head, would the Postmaster think it necessary to behead a Queen before Dr. Cahill's want could be supplied ? I rather think not. He would understand the matter in a figurative sense, and act upon it by handing out a representation or figure of a Queen's head. I might adduce illustrations without end, but one other will suffice. I was one day looking over a collection of busts, and a gentleman, pointing to one of them, asked, " Who is that ?" That, said I, is Sir Walter Scott. Did this gentleman misunderstand me so far as to mistake the bust for the real head of Sir Walter Scott ? Certainly not. Why, then, will we intentionally misrepresent Christ when he says this bread is my body ? The one expression is surely as plain and as easily understood as the other. I called the bust Sir Walter Scott, Christ called the bread his body. In these instances the form of expression is perfectly similar. The real bust is, in a figurative sense, Sir Walter Scott ; the real bread is, in a figurative sense, the body of Christ. But as Sir Walter Scott is not really in the bust, so the body of Christ is not really in the bread. All this is so obvious that a fool even would hardly question it. To dwell on it any longer would be to insult stupidity itself.

" St. Paul tells us," says Dr. Cahill, " that ' whosoever should eat unworthily should be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.' Guilty of the body and blood of a spirit !—Guilty of the body and blood of bread ! Guilty of the body and blood of a memorial ! Nonsense ; the greatest nonsense.

If you can apply one word of this to a memorial I will give up the question. 'Not discerning the Lord's body.' Not discerning the body of a spirit! Not discerning the body of bread! Not discerning the body of wine! Not discerning the body of a memorial! All this is absurd." Ha, ha, ha. You make me laugh, Dr. Cahill. It is the richest thing imaginable to hear you talk of an absurdity. Could anything be absurd in the eyes of a man who professes to believe Transubstantiation, which is the greatest absurdity that ever was invented since "Adam was a little boy?"

All the charity we could extend towards Dr. Cahill would not enable us to believe that he was influenced by a straightforward feeling in making the above statements. He must know as well as he is living that they are a complete misrepresentation. When he finds it impossible to support his opinions by an appeal to the Bible, he misrepresents the Scriptures, and charges his opponents with opinions which he is well aware they do not hold, and which could not possibly flow from their doctrines. His conduct, to say the least of it, is unbecoming and unmanly. A candid antagonist is always to be respected; a disingenuous opponent is particularly despicable. In this instance, Dr. Cahill could get credit for sincerity only at the expense of his intellect.

I will examine the passages of Scripture in the order in which they stand. They are so plain that they hardly require any comment. Let it be particularly observed, however, that all I am now going to quote was stated *after thanks had been given, and after it was said "This is my body."* Of course, if there was any Transubstantiation it was now over. Jesus took the cup, saying, "This *cup*," (why did he not say, this blood?) "is the New Testament" (is it literally the New Testament?) "in my blood—this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this *bread*" (if it is transubstantiated, why did he not say, this body?) "and drink this *cup*" (not this blood) "ye do show the Lord's death till he come." How do they show the Lord's death till he come? Do they literally kill him and eat his flesh and drink his blood? If it is to be interpreted literally, and not spiritually, the Roman Catholics become the murderers of our Saviour! The showing of the death must be either literal or figurative and spiritual. If we adopt the Popish, or literal, interpretation, then it is certain that Christ is put to death in the eucharist as plainly and as truly as he was put to death on the cross. On their own principles of interpretation, Priests are chargeable with the actual crucifixion of Jesus. This is a

very gloomy view of the matter when compared with the glorious truth which is held forth in the celebration of the Lord's supper. The literal eating of the broken bread, and the literal drinking of the poured out wine, represent, in a figurative sense, the breaking of the body and the shedding of the blood of the Saviour of sinners. They are lively emblems of his broken body and shed blood; and they are well calculated to show forth, in a figurative sense, the Lord's death till he come, as well as to keep alive in our remembrance that most solemn and important event. "This do," says Jesus, "in remembrance of me." Let us proceed.—"Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this *bread*" (not this body,) "and drink this *cup*" (not this blood) "of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." As it is now utterly impossible for us actually and literally to put Jesus to death, this last clause must be interpreted in a spiritual sense. If we eat and drink unworthily, we are spiritually guilty; not guilty with our hands, but guilty in a spiritual sense, of the body and blood of Jesus. We find an analogous form of expression at the 6th verse of the 6th chapter of Hebrews, where it is said in reference to certain parties, "they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." They do not actually put Jesus on the cross, but they crucify him in a spiritual sense—in the same sense in which those who eat and drink unworthily are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. To say that a person is *spiritually* guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, is a totally different thing from saying that he is "guilty of the body and blood of a spirit, guilty of the body and blood of a memorial." They have not the most remote resemblance to each other. The one is quite possible, the other is impossible. The one is consistent with sense and reason, the other is complete nonsense. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that *bread*" (not that body,) "and drink of that *cup*;" (not that blood) "for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation" (can damnation be literally eaten and drunk?) "to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." In connection with this, Dr. Cahill says, "not discerning the body of a spirit! not discerning the body of bread! not discerning the body of wine! not discerning the body of a memorial!" What does he mean by this farrago? He will require to go to school another quarter before he will be able to show that this half acre of nonsense has anything to do with settling the meaning of the expression "not discerning the Lord's body."

It is evident from the wording of the passage that the person who eateth and drinketh without discerning the Lord's body is eating and drinking unworthily—is eating and drinking damnation to himself. It is therefore very important that we should ascertain the correct meaning of the phrase. The chief point is, are we to adopt the Popish, or *literal*, interpretation, or the Protestant, or *spiritual* exposition? We must take either the one course or the other. If we adopt Dr. Cahill's principles and make the *discernment literal*, we must of course be able to see Christ's body in the eucharist with our bodily eyes. Now I ask can Dr. Cahill do this himself? Does he even pretend that he can see the flesh in the wafer? If he can make the body of Jesus visible to our eyes in the wafer I will give up the contest. It is surely quite plain that Dr. Cahill's literal interpretation will not do here. The discernment of Christ's body, in this instance, must be *spiritual* both to Roman Catholics and to Protestants. Neither of them can literally see the body of Christ in the Eucharist. We are therefore driven, by necessity, to the Protestant, or spiritual interpretation. If we are reasoning with a blind man, and he says, "I see, I see," how will we understand him? Do we take this as an evidence that he has come to his bodily eye sight? No. We at once conclude that he has seen it in his mind. So is it with the seeing or discerning of Christ's body in the Eucharist. We cannot see it with our corporeal eye; but it is quite capable of being discerned, through faith, by our mind. If then the body of Jesus can be *spiritually seen*, have we not a right to conclude that it is possible for it to be *spiritually eaten*? Dr. Cahill's manner of treating this passage of Scripture, reminds me forcibly of the habits of the cuttle-fish.—When this extraordinary animal is hard pressed it discharges a quantity of inky coloured fluid which hides it from its pursuers. In like manner, when Dr. Cahill comes to a passage of Scripture which he knows he cannot face, as it runs directly against him, in place of attempting to give battle, he tries to hide and cover his retreat by a half acre of nonsensical expressions.

Before concluding this part of the subject, I must make an observation which Dr. Cahill perhaps is not prepared for. He is so fond of the literal interpretation, that I must treat him with an example. When it is said "whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this *cup* of the Lord, &c.," and again "so let him eat of that bread and drink of that *cup*," what are we to understand by the word *cup*? Is the interpretation now to be literal or figurative? What do you say,

Dr. Cahill? You must either deny your own principles, or you must swallow the pewter cup. You would not like to acknowledge your errors by doing the one, and the other will be a hard enough mouthful for you. You would require an experienced Surgeon at your hand when you attempt the experiment, as it will certainly require more skill than is common to get it down your throat. After a few experiments, you will probably come round to my side and understand the word cup as a *figurative* representation of the wine which the cup usually contains.

I have now gone through all Dr. Cahill's Scriptural arguments in support of Transubstantiation. My object has not been so much to show the exact meaning of the passages of Scripture in question, as to demonstrate that they could not, under any circumstances, give the slightest support to his doctrine. In defending the Sacred Oracles, I hope I have so far fulfilled my duty as to prove incontestably, that, in place of supporting such a monstrous and unheard of absurdity, they give the fullest, the fairest, and the most complete testimony on the other side. I trust I have shown that the Scriptures give no countenance whatever to a doctrine which no amount of evidence could establish; and that I have so far supported their claim to our entire confidence as the words of the very living God.

You will hear from me next week, Mr. Editor, in regard to Dr. Cahill's extraordinary answers to objections.

Yours truly,

Coleraine, 25th July, 1853.

SEVENTH LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—After having finished his Scriptural arguments, Dr. Cahill proceeds to the consideration of those objections which have been raised against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. "It is said," he observes, "does not Christ call himself a door, a vine, a shepherd, and was he any of these really? I answer he does call himself a vine, a door, and a shepherd, but the case is not parallel. When he does thus speak, I admit it was in metaphor, and the Jews so understood him, and there was *no dispute*, but when he speaks literally he was disbelieved, and they said, 'how can this man give us his flesh to eat,' and they went away." You *admit*, Dr. Cahill, it was in metaphor. Then, I suppose the matter is settled. *Your* admission amounts to a thorough demonstration of the fact! How innocent you are! Do you really imagine you are going to get off in this simple way? I would thank you if you would take the trouble of assigning the reasons which have induced you to admit the metaphorical interpretation here? I rather think they would enable me to settle the meaning of the words "this is my body." Why will you be so inconsistent as to take the one in a metaphorical sense and refuse to do the same with the other? Christ says, "I am the door," and he also says, "this is my body." Is the one not as literal as the other? Does he not as plainly assert that he is the door, as that the bread is his body? Where can you make a distinction? On what principle of interpretation do you found the difference? You cannot be permitted to interpret Scripture according to mere fancy. If you have no definite principles to guide you, you are unfit for the task you have undertaken—you are floundering in the mud. Will you therefore be good enough to give us even one argument founded upon necessary truth, upon the recognised principles of the laws of language, or upon common sense, which would justify you in adopting a literal exposition in the one place and rejecting it in the other? Every argument you can adduce for proving that the bread is really Christ's body, will answer my purpose to the fullest extent in proving that he was really a door, and a shepherd. It is just as plainly and explicitly stated that he is a door, a vine, and a shepherd, as that the bread is his

body. Whatever would make the one literal, would make the other equally so, and the reverse. They must either be both literal or both figurative. We are consistent because we interpret them both on the same principle, but you are inconsistent because you make one figurative and the other literal, without being able to assign any valid reason whatever for so doing. It was certainly a great mistake in your Church to invent the Transubstantiation of the bread, without, at the same time, inventing the Transubstantiation of the body into a door, a vine, &c. This, at least, would have made you consistent with yourselves, although opposed to common sense. When Christ says, "this bread is my body," I maintain it must be so in a figurative, and not in a literal, sense, simply because it *could not* be otherwise without overturning necessary truth, reason, and common sense. All my senses testify that, in place of being real flesh and blood, it is still bread; and it is a self-evident fact that it could not be Christ's real body and a piece of bread at the same time. When you dispute my premises, I adduce a parallel case where Jesus calls himself a door, and I ask you, would you consider it safe to deposit your money in a bank that had no other door to protect it but one of this description? You would at once shrug up your shoulders and say, no. You would now find a variety of arguments for a figurative interpretation respecting the door, but the misfortune for you is, that every one of them could be turned, with the greatest facility, against your favourite dogma of Transubstantiation. You were lately very vociferous in ridiculing your opponents, and in blindfolding your audience by the use of a collection of the most nonsensical expressions, but it does not seem to have occurred to you that these are equally applicable to yourself, when you make the door figurative and not literal. I admit that, under any circumstances, they are nonsensical; but as you seem to have prized them very highly, I will give them back to you in their own form. You are perfectly welcome to your own. When Jesus states that he is the door, and that all who come into the sheepfold must come in by that very door, you say he is speaking metaphorically or figuratively; but, for the purpose of exposing your inconsistencies, I reply, in your own identical form of expression, that he is speaking of coming into the fold by a *reality*, not a *metaphor*; coming in by a *reality*, not a *spirit*; coming in by a *reality*, not a *figure*. The door of a figure! The door of a spirit! The door of a metaphor! Nonsense; the greatest nonsense. What do you think of yourself now, Dr. Cahill? Where do these jaw-breaking expressions, which

were intended to overwhelm us, place you? If you had been possessed of the slightest perspicacity, you would have seen that you were cutting a rod to beat yourself, when you thus attempted to turn the figurative interpretation adopted by your opponents into ridicule. I am surprised you are not ashamed of such shallowness and stupidity. Go! hide your diminished head from the public gaze. You are pitiable for your intellectual insignificance.

You tell us, however, the passages in question are not parallel. In what respect are they not parallel? Do you allege any want of parallelism in so far as the words or expressions used are concerned? No. If you did this successfully you would come off victorious; *but to do so is not in your power.* Where then does the want of resemblance lie? Why, simply, according to your own showing, in the manner in which the words were understood. You say the Jews *understood* him in the one case, to speak in metaphor, "and there was *no dispute*, but when," in the other case, "he speaks literally, he was *disbelieved*, and they said, 'how can this man give us his flesh to eat,' and they went away." This position is so novel, so insidious, and so deceptive, that I cannot pass it over in a hurry. I made a determination at the outset, from which I will not now depart, of answering, without fear, favour, or affection, *every* argument adduced by you in favour of Transubstantiation, in the order in which they have been reported to me. You here lay down a principle, Dr. Cahill, which would envelope the Word of God and the writings of men in the greatest possible uncertainty. According to your plan, the meaning is not to depend upon the proper acceptation of the words used, and upon the laws of language, but upon the whims and caprices of those who read them. The meaning of a sentence would thus vary with every variation which would occur in the exercise of thought over the whole human family. No rational being could rest satisfied with such a ridiculous principle. There must be some rule to guide us in ascertaining the meaning of a writer. If there are no definite principles, there is no room for discussion, because a definite meaning could never be arrived at. Accuracy in writing is of no use if the language is not to bear a determinate construction. To alter the meaning of a sentence according as it may suit the interests of particular individuals is perfectly absurd. What would you say if a lawyer were to adopt your principle in the construction he would put on an act of parliament? Would any judge stultify himself by sitting to hear a prisoner defended on your plan? Here is a case, Sir, in

which it is ascertained that the prisoner has committed a crime which brings him, as plainly as words can make it, within the meaning of a particular act of parliament. Let us now see what effect will be produced by the line of defence adopted by your counsel. He admits the prisoner has committed the deed alleged, but he denies he is amenable to the law on that account, because the act of parliament was not *understood* in that sense. The question does not turn upon the ordinary and proper meaning of the words of the act, but upon the meaning which the prisoner attributed to them. If he understood them in his own sense he is not guilty. It is possible the prosecutor might be right if all the world agreed with his interpretation; but, in this instance, the prisoner cannot be condemned, because he has raised a *dispute* about the construction of the act of parliament, and it has been settled by Dr. Cahill that the moment a dispute arises the words are to be understood in a different sense entirely.—The question is not, what is the ordinary and proper meaning of the words in the connexion in which they stand; but in what sense have they been *understood* by the prisoner, and has any *dispute* arisen concerning their meaning. These last points alone are of importance, and on account of them, says the lawyer, I pronounce the prisoner not guilty. “Mr. Sheriff,” says the judge, “take this Barrister under your charge, and have him safely conveyed to a lunatic asylum.”

Your argument, Dr. Cahill, about the want of parallelism is not founded on the regular and proper import of the words used by our Saviour, but on the consequences which followed, at the time, from the use of these words:—In the one case, you interpret the language of Jesus in a figurative sense, because you say it was so *understood* by his hearers; and, in the other case, you stick, through fire and water, to the literal exposition, because a *dispute* arose and Jesus was *disbelieved*. You take the dispute and the disbelief as an evidence that he was speaking literally, and you consider the absence of them as a proof that he was speaking figuratively. Would this view of the matter recommend itself to any rational creature? According to this plan the intentions of the speaker or writer are not to be judged of by the ordinary and proper meaning of the language employed, but by the meaning which the or readers may attach to it. The language may have a different application to-day and another to-morrow, just as it may be affected by the prejudices and ignorance of the people. Such is your view, of which we have heard so much! The only remedy that could be made for it is that your case is a des-

perate one. You are so very hard up that you must make a desperate effort, and resort to every expedient to keep the life in. Any port, good, bad, or indifferent, in the time of a storm.

I will now try your principles of interpretation on two portions of Scripture, which, I think, will be quite sufficient to expose their absurdity. We find in the 3d chapter of John that Jesus says to Nicodemus "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." How will your principles do now? To be born again naturally is impossible, and hence the language of Jesus must be interpreted in a figurative and spiritual sense, when he says a man is to be born again. Indeed it is evident from what Christ says in a subsequent part of the chapter that *he* meant it all in a spiritual sense. According to your idea it must be interpreted figuratively, if it was understood in that sense at the time, and there was no dispute. Unfortunately, however, Nicodemus, although he was "a master of Israel," spoils the whole affair. He *disputes* or *argues* the point with Christ, and most palpably *understands* it all in a literal sense. He says "how can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" And again, he asks, "How can these things be?" What are you to do now? Nicodemus has argued the point with Christ, and has *understood* him literally. Literal, therefore, it must now be, if you are consistent with your own principles. The only remedy for you now is to invent a new sort of transubstantiation by which a man will be able to enter a second time into his mother's womb, so that he may be literally born again. If you keep to your own law of interpretation, you must either do this or exclude your followers from heaven, because without being born again they cannot see the Kingdom of God. Again, Jesus says, at the 19th verse of the second chapter of John, "destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Is this literal or figurative? On your plan the point is to be determined by the way in which the Jews *understood* it, and not by the laws which apply to the use of language. How, then, did they understand it? "Then, said the Jews, forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days?" What do you say now, Dr. Cahill? Did the Jews *understand* Christ in a metaphorical sense? Was he believed, or was he *disbelieved*? They did not then believe him, and they understood him to speak literally. Literal, therefore, on your principles of interpretation it must be. But unfortunately for an unlucky wight like you, the

Scriptures ruin your case, because they afterwards inform us that "he spake of the temple of his body."

In accordance with the suggestions thrown out by one of the correspondents of the *Derry Sentinel* relative to the publication of these letters in a cheap and permanent form, I may here state, that, so soon as they are finished, I will be most happy to adopt, in regard to them, whatever plan may appear most likely to promote the cause of Protestantism, which is the cause of liberty, of the Bible, and of God.

Yours truly.

Coleraine, August 1st, 1853.

EIGHTH LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—Dr Cahill observes, "It is said Transubstantiation is impossible. Now the very first official act of God at the creation was Transubstantiation. He made or Transubstantiated clay into Adam, and bone into Eve. And Christ's first official act was Transubstantiation. He made or changed water into wine. Moses Transubstantiated the rod into a serpent, and water into blood. Can we not do what Moses did when we have got the Holy Ghost to enable us to do so?" From this it is quite evident that Dr. Cahill is totally incapable of correct reasoning, or else he was intentionally trying to mislead his audience. The facts to which he refers have not the most remote resemblance to Transubstantiation. They are as different from it as day is from night. It is scarcely possible to confound them together. In fact, the man who cannot here recognise a distinction is a confirmed simpleton. In the one case we could believe only against reason and common sense, whilst in the other case our judgment would be founded on the irresistible evidence of our senses. In the one case the facts alleged would be completely disproved by an appeal to our senses and rational nature, whilst in the other case they would be confirmed and thoroughly established by being submitted to such a criterion. What is Transubstantiation? Simply this. The priest takes a piece of bread, and after having gone through some palaver over it he tells us it is con-

verted into the full grown body of Christ—it is no longer bread, but real flesh and blood. When we come to examine it, however, we find that to our senses of sight, touch, taste, &c., it is still bread. Examine it as closely as you will—put it to the most rigorous test you can—and every sense you have in the world will pass a solemn affidavit that it is not in the slightest degree changed. All the evidence we can adduce from necessary truth, from common sense, from reason, and from our senses, is here set at defiance by the mere word of the priest. You are very modestly asked to become a fool for the purpose of believing him. Is this case in the slightest degree analogous to those Dr. Cahill has mentioned? When God made Adam out of the clay, did any of the senses say he was still a piece of clay, and not flesh and blood? So far from its being evident to the senses that the human body is made of clay, such an idea would never enter into our imagination if we were not told of it as a fact. How, then, is this a case of Transubstantiation? It is the very opposite. That a great change has actually taken place is quite easily seen. A living man is never mistaken for a lump of clay. In place of being against the testimony of the senses, this case is in the most complete accordance with it. The example of Eve is not one whit more to the purpose. It is self-evident to the senses that she is composed of flesh and blood. We cannot avoid believing it. We know she was made out of a bone, because God has said it was so. If God had not told us of it, we would not credit it. The change is both great and apparent. No man in his senses could mistake a human rib for a full-grown woman. If the belief that his legs, &c., are made of glass is sufficient to consign a man to the mad-house, and to place his property under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor, surely the same course ought to be adopted with regard to the woman who could believe that her body had neither flesh nor blood, but had entirely resolved itself into a little bit of bone. The great and insurmountable difference between these examples and Transubstantiation is this:—In the one case when a change is said to have occurred, it is evident, on the strictest investigation by all our senses, that this change has actually taken place; whereas, in the other case, it is equally evident to our senses that no such change as that stated has happened at all. Surely this difference is decisive. If we were called upon to believe that a piece of clay, whilst it retained all the properties and qualities of clay, was the body of a real living man, and that a little bone, whilst it retained all the properties and qualities of a bone, was a real

full-grown woman, then we would be called upon to believe in a case of Transubstantiation, but not otherwise.

I suspect Dr. Cahill will fare no better with the example of Christ changing the water into wine. To make this a case of Transubstantiation it would require to be shown that at the very time it was wine it had all the sensible properties and qualities of water. If it is changed in colour, in taste, in smell, in its chemical properties, and in its effects upon the human constitution, it cannot any longer be called water, and no rational man would designate it by that title. It has now become an entirely new substance. If we follow our reason and our senses we cannot avoid believing that it is changed. This, however, is not Transubstantiation. The essential ingredient in Transubstantiation is, that the thing must have all the sensible and chemical properties, qualities, and effects of one substance, whilst it is said and believed to be another substance which differs from it in all these properties as far as light differs from darkness. When Jesus converted the water into wine did he tell them, this is real wine, although it still has the colour, taste, and all the chemical and other properties of water? Did he say, you must take my word for it against your senses, and believe it to be real wine, although it wants the colour, taste, smell, and intoxicating qualities of wine? No. But he adopted the practical test, and submitted it to the palate of the governor of the feast, who, when he had *tasted* it, not only believed it to be wine, but also testified that it was the best wine they had yet got. This is not very like Transubstantiation. When Dr. Cahill performs a miracle of this description he may begin to talk, but not till then.

As the same observations are all equally applicable to the cases in which Moses was concerned, I need not waste time by repeating them here. The water was visibly converted into blood, and the rod evidently became a real serpent. This is not Transubstantiation.

Dr. Cahill is here confounding the working of miracles with Transubstantiation; but the two things are very different from each other. A miracle is possible—Transubstantiation is impossible. In a miracle there is a complete, entire, and palpable change—in Transubstantiation there is none whatever. A miracle can appeal, with the greatest confidence, to the senses and reason of man for the reality of the change which is said to have occurred—Transubstantiation is an appeal to the blindest credulity and fanaticism against all sense and reason. I defy Dr. Cahill to produce one instance, from Scripture, in which a miracle was performed without a cor-

responding change having at the same time taken place. When Christ converted the water into wine it assumed all the properties of wine. When the blind man was cured he did not see and remain blind at the same time. The withered hand did not regain its power whilst it remained withered. When the cripple was healed by Paul he did not walk and sit still at the same instant. When Lazarus was raised from the dead he was not both dead and alive at the same time. In all these cases the change was quite evident to the senses. Dr. Cahill ought to do something similar before he begins to boast about his power. If he would attempt a transubstantiation of this description, he would soon loose the confidence of his followers—their reason would get the better of their credulity. Here is Lazarus, Dr. Cahill, bring him to life if you can. The beads are counted, the prayers are said, the manœuvres are all performed, and the dead man is ordered to come forth; but he is as deaf as a door nail, as senseless as a block, and as immoveable as a stone. The failure is complete. Try it again, my good fellow. Be not faithless but believing, says the Doctor, putting a very long face on himself. You are labouring under a serious mistake. I assure you I have got the Holy Ghost to enable me to do this, and it is done most effectually. I am a devout and holy member of the infallible Church, and you must take my word for it in opposition to your own eyes. Your senses are all imperfect and unworthy of credit. If you depend on them they will certainly lead you astray. To the uninitiated and heretical this man may still appear to be dead, but every person who has the right sort of faith will at once believe that he is alive and kicking. He is running about as active as a bee. To your eyes he may appear dead, but I assure you he is alive "in a sacramental mode." The Holy Mother Church tells you this is the case, and you must not doubt it. You must not place your fallacious eye-sight in opposition to your faith. God can easily make this miracle true. To deny it is to limit His power. There is nothing impossible with God.

Dr. Cahill asks, "can we not do what Moses did, when we have got the Holy Ghost to enable us to do so." I now call upon him to prove, by converting a rod into a serpent, that he can do what Moses did. Let him try his hand on some miracles similar to those which are recorded in Scripture. I have, already, offered him a handsome reward if he will prove, by removing its intoxicating qualities, that he can convert wine into blood. Although I have put this before him in a way which defies a reasonable objection from any human being, he has

not yet responded to the call. I have also offered him a large sum if he will establish his power over a poisonous wafer, by swallowing it with impunity. He may attempt to get out of this by saying God gave him power to change bread, but did not give him power to change poison. This objection, however, will at once put him into an awkward predicament with regard to the wine which contains no poison. Besides, if, like Moses, he possesses miraculous gifts he has nothing to fear. Jesus says, with regard to those who believe and possess miraculous power, "*if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them.*" If you have read this, Dr. Cahill, in the last chapter of Mark's Gospel, why are you afraid?

Some parties may think my practical test about the wafer is too severe to be a fair one. The shilly-shally Editor of the *Cork Constitution* took this view of the case. But I maintain that neither it nor the one about the wine goes a sufficient length to test Transubstantiation. They are both too favourable to Popery. They merely call upon Dr. Cahill, who belongs to a Church *which claims miraculous gifts*, to perform a miracle, which, with God's power, is perfectly possible. They only ask him to change one substance into another substance entirely different from itself; but this is not Transubstantiation. In Transubstantiation, the bread must be both bread and the full-grown body of Christ at the same time. It is here the absurdity and impossibility lie. Bread could be changed into human flesh, but it could not be bread and flesh at the same time. Further; if it were converted into a body of Christ, it must be a second body of Christ—it could not be the body which was placed upon the Cross. This would involve a contradiction which could not be true. My body might be made so like the body of the late Duke of Wellington that you could not distinguish the difference, but still it would not be the very same body which led the troops to glory and to victory on the field of Waterloo. It is impossible for one body to be *identically the same* with another which is *identically different from it*.

It would be quite easy for God, by the performance of a miracle, to convert a piece of bread into a full-grown human body; but I say, after due deliberation, that Transubstantiation is not possible even with God himself. To say that the bread can be the body of Christ, whilst it continues to be bread, is to state a contradiction, and God could not be the author of a contradiction. Some people may think this statement rash and irreverent; but, I confess, I have no sympathy with the man who is afraid to face immutable truth.

in its naked boldness and severity. A scriptural and truthful reverence for God is greatly to be prized ; but that whining, puny, mawkish, ignorant, and superstitious reverence for the Deity, which, rather than state the truth fairly and boldly in all its glory, would allow the perfections and character of our Great Creator to be misrepresented and maligned, is greatly to be dreaded and always to be shunned. A contradiction cannot possibly be true, it must be a lie, and consequently God cannot be its author. " Let God be true," says the Scripture, " but every man a liar." " God is not man that he should lie." It is "*impossible for God to lie.*" Who now will have the hardihood to say God can tell a lie for the purpose of establishing Transubstantiation. It is an awful thing to charge God with being a liar. The idea that God could make Transubstantiation true, has arisen from a misunderstanding about the *nature* of Omnipotence. " The reconciliation of a contradiction is not an object of power. It is not the want of power that renders this possible. Greater power would not make it possible. It is impossible from its inconsistency, and it would be contrary to the divine perfections, to suppose God to convert falsehood into truth. To assert that he could make the same thing to exist and not to exist at the same time, is to suppose that he could lie. A feeble creature can lie ; but the Almighty cannot lie," because to do so would be inconsistent with his perfections. Why would we consider it a great point of *weakness* in man to tell a lie, and look upon the same act as an evidence of the *power* of God ? A man who could lift a ton weight might consider himself very powerful, but there are few who would consider it any addition to their power to be able to tell lies. When it is said, in the first chapter of Luke, " with God nothing is impossible," it is evident from the context that this has reference to his omnipotent power in reference to the miraculous conception of Mary. It refers to his power to do a great and miraculous work, but it has no reference whatever to his capability of telling lies, which would be a complete evidence of his weakness. I once heard an anecdote very much to my present purpose. Two men were talking, in the presence of a simpleton, about everything being possible with God. The simpleton at once asked " could he make two bills without a hollow ?" What do you think of this, Dr. Cahill ? Is it an object of power, or is it a thing which is impossible on account of its contradictory nature ? The simpleton had more sense than yourself. My late father quotes a case which was related by the late Mr. O'Connell. A Jew was accused of biting

off a man's nose. "There were only two persons besides the sufferer in company at the time, each of them asserted his innocence, and declared that the man bit off his own nose. It was observed that it was not possible. 'Nothing is impossible with God,' said the Jew. Don't laugh at the poor Jew. Mr. O'Connell, if the doctrine of your Church be true, you might bite off your own nose and your own head; yea, you might swallow yourself, body and bones. The very answer of the Jew is the answer of your doctors—nothing is impossible with God."

Yours truly.

Coleraine, August 6th, 1853.

NINTH LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—When Protestants declare they cannot believe Transubstantiation because it involves a direct contradiction, they are frequently taunted by Roman Catholics for believing in the doctrine of the Trinity. In a conversation which I heard a few days since between two gentlemen in a railway carriage, in the county of Kerry, it was stated that these doctrines are both on a par, and that they must be looked upon, and believed, as a mystery. Now let us assume for argument's sake that the doctrine of the Trinity does contain a contradiction, and I ask what is to be the consequence? Will that make either it or Transubstantiation true? Certainly not. It would afford an insuperable argument for throwing them both to the winds. Would there be any sense in believing one lie because another thing might happen to be a lie also? No wise man would take this course; and I am surprised Roman Catholics do not see the shallowness of their argument. There is one rule to which there never can be an exception—everything which is proved to contain a contradiction must be false, and should at once be rejected. It is perfectly absurd for Papists to think they have a right to believe Transubstantiation, because their opponents hold another doctrine which some might think equally contradictory. The one being false does not make the other true. If men were to act upon such a princi-

ple in their worldly affairs, they would very soon discover their mistake. It is only in matters of religion that men can play the fool with impunity in this life. Suppose, for example, I have got a pound note, which is a forgery. It bears this quite plain upon the face of it. I have often tried to pass it, but I was always foiled. Fortunately, however, I at last heard of a banker who was so far overseen and mistaken as to take a forged note also. I at once repaired to him and offered him my note for change, but he would not have it at all. He said it was a forgery, and consequently was of no use. You are quite wrong, sir, said I, in refusing this note, because I can prove that you have a bad note in your own possession, and you ought to take this one also from me. Mine is of no use by itself, but if it is put along with your bad one they will both become good enough. The banker was foolish enough to say that the fact of the notes being forged was quite a sufficient reason for throwing them both in the fire; but as I am a good and loyal member of the Infallible Mother Church I will not give up my note, although by itself it is bad, because it will immediately become good if I can only get another like itself to put along with it. I cannot see any possible objection to this, as I know that a thing which, like Transubstantiation, is absurd and contradictory by itself, is quite rational and true if it is placed in juxtaposition with another doctrine, held by Protestants, which I can show involves a contradiction also. One contradiction can make another true—one bad note can make another good—on the same principle which will convert a great number of fallible beings into one Infallible Church. Protestants may laugh and say this is a fiddle-diddle mode of reasoning, but I have a decided preference for following our infallible head, the Pope.

I have just been supposing for argument's sake that the Trinity involves a contradiction, but I most solemnly declare I do not believe this is the case, and I am quite certain no man has yet been able to establish it as a fact. The doctrine of the Trinity is entirely misrepresented when it is put forth in the shape of a contradiction. It would, certainly, be a contradiction to say that one God is three Gods, and that three Gods are one God; and also to say that one person is three persons, and that three persons are one person. If this were our doctrine—it is often palmed upon us by our enemies—we would, indeed, be believing a thing which is doubly ridiculous and absurd. But happily this is neither the doctrine of Trinitarians nor of the Bible. The three persons are one God, and the one God is three persons. They

are not three in the same sense in which they are one, nor one in the same sense in which they are three. They are three in one sense and one in another sense. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are not three Gods and one God, but they are three persons and one God. In their personality they are three; in their Godhead they are one. It is surely as plain as the light of heaven that there is no contradiction here. In one sense they are three, in another sense they are one; but they are not one in the same sense in which they are three, nor three in the same sense in which they are one. Consequently the Trinity does not involve a contradiction, although it is altogether incomprehensible. It is no contradiction to say that my soul and body, in place of forming two individuals, constitute only my individual self, although I cannot, by any means, comprehend the wonderful manner in which they are united, so as to make me one, and not two. A thing which is contradictory is very different from one which is incomprehensible. If we confound these together we will be liable to great mistakes. The thing which is incomprehensible is removed far above and beyond the reach of our reason. It may be true or it may be false for ought our reason can tell. We have a right to receive or reject it, according to the nature and amount of the evidence by which it may be supported. We should not receive it without proper and sufficient evidence; but if it is thoroughly and satisfactorily attested, it is the act of a madman to reject it. If we have God's Word for its truth, we are quite safe in receiving it—we can ask no better; but in a thing which is beyond our reason, we should not set up our judgment against the express statements of God. The case of a contradiction is very different from this. In the very nature of things, it is within the province of our reason. We could not know it to be a contradiction unless we could perfectly comprehend it as far as the contradiction reached. The moment the contradiction appears, that moment our reason has taken hold of it. If our reason does not see the contradiction, we have no grounds for supposing it is there. We can see a contradiction as plainly as we can see that two and two make four, and in my judgment far plainer. A child does not always know that two and two make four, but the meanest capacity can at once recognize a contradiction—a child knows that it cannot be dead and alive in the same sense and at the same time. The moment a contradiction is stated our reason gets hold of it, and on intuitive, self-evident principles, rejects it as a lie. No evidence could establish its truth. To believe

a contradiction is the part of a fool, but a wise man will receive an incomprehensible thing as true, provided God pledges his word for it. We would not be justified in rejecting the Trinity on account of its incomprehensibility, any more than we would be justified in denying, for the same reason, such things as eternity, time, immensity, and space, which are all self-evidently true. We cannot avoid believing in these, although we can neither fathom nor comprehend them. In fact we believe in thousands of things which we are unable to fathom; but there can be no apology whatever for our believing in things which are contradictory. The first may be true, the last must be absolutely false.

Dr. Cahill proceeds thus, "when you hold bread opposite a mirror, is it bread you see in the glass? No. Only the appearance of bread. You believe natural philosophy can present only the appearance of bread here; and yet you deny the infinite God can do the same in religion, although he is the Lord and master of nature." In this case, Dr. Cahill, the senses do not deceive us. The eyes tells us very plainly that there is the appearance of bread in the glass; and that is the full extent of its province. It is not commissioned to do the duty of all the other senses. If we wish to ascertain whether it is real bread or only the likeness of bread which we see in the glass, we must have recourse to the additional testimony of the sense of touch, and perhaps of taste also. When they are all brought to bear upon the matter, in place of contradicting each other, they will enable us to arrive at a certain and safe conclusion. If we see the appearance of bread, but can neither touch it nor taste it, we can have no hesitation in believing it is merely the shadow or likeness of bread. But, I ask, Dr. Cahill, how do you know there is bread in the glass either in appearance or in reality? You have already impeached the accuracy of the senses in regard to the wafer, and you surely would not be so very inconsistent as to call upon them now to give evidence as to the appearance or the reality of the bread in the glass. I suspect, if you were permitted, you would maintain they were perfectly trustworthy so long as they testified in your favour; but you would consider them perjured villians the moment they appeared to lean to the other side. If the senses are not to be relied upon, neither you nor I can tell anything whatever about the appearance of the bread in the mirror. It is only through them we can gain any information on the subject. Here we are both equally compelled to depend upon them. In this instance, as well as in the oft-repeated case of the stick

appearing crooked when partially immersed in water, the eye fulfils its task in the most satisfactory manner. It acts in the strictest accordance with the determinate laws of the reflection and the refraction of the rays of light, and if you are as great a philosopher as you pretend to be, you must know this. If you mistake the appearance of bread for the reality, or if you imagine the stick is crooked when it is really straight, the blame must not be placed upon the eye which is acting in harmony with the strict laws of light. It is owing entirely to the inaccurate and hasty manner in which you arrive at your conclusions. In place of having recourse to the additional testimony of touch, &c., you depend upon sight alone; and thus, by putting the duty of two or more senses upon one, you are led to a rash conclusion. As I rely upon all my senses, I can ascertain the exact position of the facts; but as you repudiate the accuracy of every one of them, you have no foundation whatever to rest the evidence upon. So long as you stand to your own principles, you must be as ignorant of the appearance of the bread and of the stick as you would be if you were a lifeless corpse.

But even on your own showing, Dr. Cahill, I deny your conclusion is warranted by your premises. What Protestant ever denied that God could make a piece of bread into a body, having all the appearance of Christ's body? We do not deny any such thing. But we deny it can have the appearance of Christ's body when it has not the appearance of his body.—In place of having the appearance of Christ's body, it has both the appearance and reality of a piece of bread. You must be very stupid if you cannot see that your illustration is altogether inapplicable to Transubstantiation. In order to make it applicable, you would require to show that the bread in the eucharist is so far altered that it has all the appearance of Christ's body. It must at least be in such a condition that the eye, unassisted by the other senses, would at once draw the conclusion that it was his body and not bread; whereas the very opposite of this is the case in point of fact. You tell us it is his body, but the eye says it has not the most remote resemblance to it. Show us the appearance of the body in the wafer, or else hold your tongue.

You may perhaps say, however, that as the figure in the glass has the appearance of bread without the reality, so the bread in the eucharist has the appearance of bread without the reality; but you are as far out here as ever. The one is only the image of bread, the other is real bread. The one is incapable of being touched or tasted, the other can be both

touched and eaten. When all the senses are brought to bear upon the one, the judgment will inevitably conclude it is only an image ; but when they are brought to bear in a similar manner upon the other, we cannot hesitate in believing that it is real bread. How, then, can you make it appear that the cases are similar, or that your illustration is in any degree applicable to your purpose ? Further, we do not deny that you might have the likeness or appearance of bread without having the bread itself ; but we most positively deny that so long as the entire substance of the bread itself is present, there is nothing whatever there but its mere image. If you bring forward a picture of bread, in place of real bread, for the eucharist, we will at once admit there is no bread there ; but we will not, on this account, allow ourselves to be so far deceived as to imagine there is nothing more than a shadow, when we see, feel, and taste a piece of real bread. Transubstantiation is doubly ridiculous. It first assumes that the bread in the eucharist is not real bread but only a mere shadow, although all our senses testify the very reverse ; and it next maintains that Christ's body is really, substantially, and entirely present in the wafer, although a telescope fifteen times more powerful than Lord Rosse's could not discover the smallest portion of his body in it. We are first called upon to believe a thing does not really exist which all our senses testify does really exist ; and then we are further to believe that a thing does exist although we have not the slightest shadow of evidence for its existence—if we were to look for it till doomsday we could neither see it nor handle it. Such an absurdity never was heard of.

"When John was at Jordan," says Dr. Cahill, "baptizing our Lord, the people saw the appearance of a dove ; 'it was like a dove,' but it was only so in appearance. It was the Holy Spirit." In this illustration, Dr. Cahill, you are as far from your purpose as ever. The Holy Spirit assumed the form or appearance of a dove, and as a matter of course it then looked like a dove. To the eye it had all the appearance of a dove. The eye here does not deceive us, but testifies exactly in accordance with the facts. When the appearance of a dove was present, it recognized it and did not mistake it for anything else. Hence it fulfilled its part, as its province is strictly confined to appearance. But the case of Transubstantiation is very different from this. The bread not only presents the appearance of bread, but, on the strictest investigation, it is also found to contain the reality of bread, and nothing else. When you are able to remove all the physical

properties from the bread except its mere appearance, you may talk, but not till then.

"Christ," you say, "is present under the appearance of bread and wine—present in a sacramental mode." What do you mean by this? Do you mean that he is spiritually, invisibly, and figuratively present? There are only two ways in which he can be present. He must be present either spiritually and figuratively, or actually and literally. Which of these do you adopt? You must take either the one or the other. The figurative, or Protestant, sense will not do you.—You must have the literal. But, as you have left nothing but the mere appearance of bread, I would like to know how the entire body of Christ can be actually present in a shadow. To say he is invisibly present under the mere shadow or appearance of bread is incontestably admitting that he is not really present in his bodily capacity—it is virtually giving up the whole question. This, however, does not square very well with the remaining doctrine of your church, which teaches that in the "sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, &c." The literal, actual, presence is here asserted as plainly as possible. I have already shown so fully, by the most incontestable evidence, that Christ cannot be literally present in the mass, that I need not return to the subject again. It gives the direct lie to the senses and reason of man, and, consequently, cannot be true.

We may, perhaps, be told that the bread is really changed into the body of Christ, although its outward sensible qualities remain the same as before consecration; but this is perfectly absurd. If the sensible, physical qualities, and properties of the bread remain unchanged, there is no change of substance. The moment a real change occurs, that moment the physical qualities change with it. When Christ changed water into wine, it assumed all the qualities and properties of wine. When the rod was converted into a serpent, it assumed all the qualities and properties of a serpent. If it had still preserved the appearance of a rod, Moses would not have fled from before it, as we are told he did. It is ridiculous to say one substance is changed into another substance whilst its qualities and properties remain unaltered. What evidence have we of the existence of anything except what is derived from its qualities and properties? A man might as well say

a black crow was white as to say that anything could be flesh which has none of the qualities and properties of flesh. It is a contradiction in terms. Such things may pass current with a set of religious madmen; but they will not take so well in worldly affairs. I never yet met a Roman Catholic who would apply his religious theories to his daily business. He opens his eyes when he comes to the pounds, shillings, and pence. You say, Dr. Cahill, a substance may be entirely changed, although its qualities and properties remain unaltered. Here, then, is a piece of copper, will you take it for a gold guinea? I have got a miracle performed upon it and it is now pure gold. I grant it has not the consistence, the hardness, the weight, nor the colour of gold; but this makes no difference, because, according to the doctrines of your church, a substance may be entirely changed whilst all its properties remain the same; this coin may have all the qualities and properties of copper, but I assure you it is true gold. I am inclined to suspect, Dr. Cahill, that I might preach this doctrine long enough without having much effect upon your practice. The jingle of this coin would not add much to the efficacy of your prayers for the dead. Nothing but the genuine article would attract your attention here.

I remain, Mr. Editor, yours truly.

Coleraine, August 23d, 1853.

TENTH LETTER

ON DR. CAHILL'S SERMON ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—I forgot to mention in my last letter that Dr. Cahill need not hesitate to try my practical test, if he is really serious in thinking there is nothing left in the Eucharist, after the blessing is pronounced, but the mere shadow or appearance of the bread and wine, the same as could be seen reflected in a mirror. He might very easily earn my money on the wine, as I am sure no person is afraid of getting drunk on its shadow. Drunkenness from the mere appearance or shadow of wine would be a novelty. I would like very much to see a fellow made drunk by looking at the reflection of wine in a mirror!

"Christ," says Dr. Cahill, "after His resurrection, stood in the centre of His apostles, and that without coming in through or by the door, for the doors were shut at the time. He was thus *really* present ; but how He came there we cannot tell, the fact only we know." By what authority do you state, Dr. Cahill, He did not come in through or by the door? You are here adding to the Scriptures, for they make no such assertion. They give us no information as to how or by what means He came in. In our present state of information it is impossible to tell how He came in. That point is not revealed. The Scripture statement is this—"When the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst." And again—"Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst." It is evident, *when he came* the doors were shut, and we have reason to conclude that his disciples imagined He came in whilst the doors were shut ; but it is not certain from this, nor is it actually so stated, that the doors were shut *during the time* He was entering the room. This may or may not have been the case for aught we can tell. It is quite possible he might have opened the door and closed it again without being observed ; and the mere possibility of a thing, although it will not prove a case, is quite sufficient to solve a difficulty. I might produce a considerable number of plausible arguments for the purpose of showing that He came in by the door, or some other equally convenient passage, but this course I do not choose to adopt, because the Scriptures evidently and purposely leave us in the dark as to the manner of His entry into the apartment. We are not justified in *asserting* that he entered in a miraculous manner, because the opposite is within the bounds of possibility ; but I confess it appears to me more *probable* that such was really the mode of his entry. At all events, in order to give my Roman Catholic opponents the full benefit of all they can produce, I will assume that He did enter the room in a miraculous way ; and I still maintain that it is not the same as Transubstantiation. Suppose, for example, He came in through the key-hole of the door, and what follows? Why, simply that he changed his body into some other substance which was capable of entering the key-hole. That is the whole affair, and that change he could very easily have effected. But it is altogether impossible, under any circumstances, that His body, including flesh, bones, &c., or, in other words, in its natural condition, could have entered in this way. A miracle could not make this possible. It is self-evidently impossible, and therefore cannot

be true. Nor are we by any means driven to the necessity of believing in the possibility of this, or of rejecting the Scriptures, *because it is nowhere stated that He brought His body, in its natural state, through an opening which was not sufficient to admit it.* When we find him in the room, we know on self-evident, and consequently on indisputable principles, that He either brought His body, in its natural condition, into the room by an opening which was amply sufficient to receive it, or else transformed it into some other substance which was capable of entering by a smaller orifice. One or other of these must be true. It is not stated that he brought His entire body, including flesh, blood, bones, &c., into the room by an orifice which was hardly capable of admitting his little finger : and therefore it is by no means analogous to Transubstantiation, which affirms that His entire body is contained in a little bit of bread. In the first case we are left entirely in the dark as to the mode of his entry, and no statement is made which, in any sense of the word, contradicts the senses and reason of man ; but in the last case, a direct and specific statement is made, which cannot possibly be true, inasmuch as it involves a plain and direct contradiction, and gives the lie to the faculties with which the allwise Creator has endowed the human race.

It matters not in what way he may have come in, you are right, Dr. Cahill, in saying He was "*really* present" in the room, and I have simply to add, that when He was really present in *His bodily capacity*, He was perfectly capable of being both seen and touched, as is evident from the passage. Now, do you just give us an example of His real presence in the wafer in the same way, and we will at once admit your miraculous power. We will ask no further evidence of his presence in the wafer than His disciples had of His presence in the room.

It appears to me very childish to refer to the case of Thomas as a reason for our believing in Transubstantiation. It is stated that as he was reprov'd for not believing without seeing and feeling, we are worthy of reproof for asking such evidence in favour of Transubstantiation. But the cases are very different. In Transubstantiation we are called upon to believe contrary to our senses and contrary to the senses of all other witnesses ; but Thomas was reprov'd for not believing the testimony of his brethren, which was founded upon the evidence of *their senses*. They told him they had seen the Lord. He would not take their word in the matter, which was very unwarrantable in him. Let us take a similar case.

If a truthful and trustworthy person were to tell me the Queen was in Dublin yesterday, and that he had seen her with his own eyes, I would be very culpable if I refused to believe him without seeing for myself. I would be treating him as a lying, incredible witness. The case, however, would be very different if I were called upon to believe that her Majesty was sitting beside me at this table, whilst my eyes told me she was not there at all, and whilst the eyes of my informant also failed completely to discover her presence. This I could not believe, nor would I be justified in believing it. In the first case I am asked to believe a perfectly possible thing on the evidence of the senses of another ; in the last case I am called upon to believe contrary to the evidence of my own senses in a matter which is directly under my own observation. Such, precisely, is the state of matters with regard to Thomas and Transubstantiation. The existence of Transubstantiation is not founded on the testimony of the senses of any man, but is universally contrary to it. Thomas was not blamed for not believing contrary to the evidence of his senses, but he was blamed for not crediting the testimony of his brethren about a thing which had been rendered perfectly plain to their senses. This surely makes all the difference in the world between these cases. So far from the 20th chapter of John being against us it is very strongly in our favour, because it is there recorded, that Jesus, in place of asking the disciples to believe contrary to their senses, actually, of His own accord, "showed unto them His hands and His side ;" and, at another meeting, He permitted Thomas to feel the wounds in His hands and His side ; so that He gave them all the fullest evidence from their own senses that He was really there. Was the same evidence of Transubstantiation ever given to any human being ? We have no evidence of its truth either from the testimony of our own senses or from that of any other person's senses.

"The most learned," says Dr. Cahill, "have embraced Catholicity." This surely is a powerful argument for its truth ! If learned men have embraced it, it cannot be false ! What says Christ ? "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because thou hast hid these things from the *wise* and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."—Christ seems to have anticipated your argument, Dr. Cahill. He does not appear to have any particular predilection for the wise and learned ; nor do we find that the generality of his immediate followers were included in what is called the literary class. A more fallacious test of the truth of any sub-

ject, either in religion or science, could hardly be imagined, than that of its being received or rejected by what is usually called learned men. In fact, it is from this class that *truth* generally gets the greatest opposition, until it is established almost by universal consent. There are some men—the really learned—who carry a philosophic spirit, and a degree of practical good sense into everything they commence, and who fearlessly embrace truth, no matter where, or under what circumstances it may be found. It generally happens, however, that those men who are usually, but improperly, designated by the title, learned, get into a beaten track, and into a humdrum way of their own, from which it is nearly impossible to dislodge them. A thing which is new will have no charms in their eyes, no matter how true it may be. I could establish these facts by an overwhelming number of examples; but a few must suffice for the present. You are said, Dr. Cahill, to be acquainted with the whole range of human science. I therefore imagine you must be aware that almost all the improvements and discoveries which were broached from time to time met with the most determined opposition from the learning of the age in which they appeared. Prinella was beat with rods for saying the stars would not fall. Camparella was seven times tortured for asserting there was a multitude of worlds. Sir Isaac Newton was violently opposed for his theory of the composition of light; and the immortal Harvey was ridiculed and persecuted by almost all his learned cotemporaries, simply because he made the grand discovery of the circulation of the blood. When Copernicus overthrew the Ptolemeian, or Aristotelian theory of the universe, by proving that the earth moves round the sun, instead of the sun round the earth, he was rewarded by having the sentence of excommunication issued against him from the court of Rome, on account of this damnable heresy. In the course of time, however, when, after the expiration of 278 years, every sensible man in the world had admitted the truth of the Copernican theory, the old dotards of Rome saw the error of their *infallible* predecessors, and expunged from their records the sentence which had been issued against Copernicus. This eminent philosopher was not long in his grave, till his favourite opinions, which had been denounced as heretical by the infallibly fallible court of Rome, were warmly espoused, and most ably supported and extended by the celebrated Galileo. But Galileo was not long permitted to live in peace. The Pope, who was numbered in the list of his persecutors, ordered the mathematicians, the monks, and the cardinals, to examine his works. These were at once

condemned, and he was brought before the *Inquisition* and cast into a dungeon. After having lain for several months in a miserable and gloomy cell, this venerable old man was brought before his persecuting judges, and was condemned to renounce, kneeling before them, with his hands upon the gospels, those sentiments about the motions of the earth, which were then called heretical, but which are now universally admitted to be true. The tortures of the *Inquisition* shook his resolution, and he renounced his opinions. He had no sooner done so, however, than he became indignant at his own conduct, and, stamping his foot upon the earth, he exclaimed—"it still moves." This sealed his doom, and incurred the sentence of imprisonment in the *Inquisition* during life—which sentence, on account of his age, was afterwards commuted to perpetual banishment. Yes, Dr. Cahill, this was the treatment which this great and venerable philosopher received at the hands of what you would call the learned, the holy, the infallible *Inquisitors* of your Holy Mother Church!!! Is it not enough to make our blood boil within us, when we think that this man, whose name will be considered great at every period of the world's future history, was obliged to submit his opinions to the judgment of a set of men, who, while they passed for being learned, were really as ignorant as *Hottentots*? Dr. Gall was the author of one of the greatest discoveries of any age, and he has fared no better than his predecessors. He was ridiculed and abused by what is called learned men, from the day in which he was banished, on account of his discoveries, by the Austrian government, from the place of his birth, until the day of his death; and his opponents included all grades of learning, from the celebrated Cuvier down to Lord Jeffrey. But how do Dr. Gall's discoveries in *Phrenology* stand now? No man of literary and scientific reputation will now dare to enter the field in *open* contest against them.*

The examples I have cited, although not a tithe of those I could produce, are quite sufficient to put us on our guard against what is commonly called learned men, either in the scientific or religious world. There is only one rule for safety,

* Attempts have been made to turn *Phrenology* against the truths of *Revelation*; but, when rightly understood, it is in the most perfect harmony with them. In my lectures, delivered in Coleraine, in the year 1844, and in Dublin, in the year 1861, I proved, beyond the possibility of dispute, that the man who denies the essential principles of *Phrenology*, if he is consistent with himself, must hold that his soul, like his body, is *material* and *mortal*. I hope some day to prove upon paper that the *Phrenologist* is the only man who can steer clear of *materialism*, and also, that *materialism* is the inevitable result of the opinions of the *metaphysical* school. I will show to a demonstration that this is no more startling than it is true.

and that is to examine the subject carefully for ourselves, without any reference to the parties by whom it may be received or rejected. If our reason must bow submission to authority—if we are to trample on private judgment and common sense—let us return at once to the opinions of Aristotle, Galen, Des Cartes, Berkeley, Stahl, and Van Helmont; the latter of whom considered the stomach was the seat of our thinking principle. If great names can prove anything, it would be impossible to overturn the opinions of these men.

Dr. Cahill considers he is giving a great blow to Protestantism by saying it took its rise in the 16th century. In this, however, he is very short-sighted. Passing over the various arguments by which it has been clearly established that the religion of Protestants is as old as the Bible, I will merely observe that age is no proof of the truth of any religion. If this were the case, the religion of the devil, if I may use the expression, would be old enough to be true. This argument is founded on a fallacious principle. The whole point of importance is, was it true at the beginning, and does it now rest on the very same foundation. If it was not true at first, time could never make it true. A lie which was told in the days of Adam would not be true now, nor at the end of the world. If it was a lie at first, it will still be a lie. So is it with Popery. If it was false at first, it is false still. The vital point for examination either in Protestantism or Popery is not its age, but the foundation upon which it began, and upon which it now rests. Whatever is resting on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ himself being the chief corner stone, cannot be gainsayed or overthrown.

After referring to the miraculous power of Moses in transforming the rod into a serpent, and water into blood, Dr. Cahill asks—"Can we not do what Moses did, when we have got the Holy Ghost to enable us to do so?" Dr. Cahill here claims, on the part of the priests of Rome, the possession of a supernatural power, which appears to me a strong proof that they are members of the apostate church. Whether they can really work miracles of any kind, or not, is not a question which I think it necessary at present to determine. It is quite sufficient for my purpose that the Church of Rome not only arrogates this power to herself, but actually prides herself particularly upon its possession. The days of miracles in favour of the true church are past, and in place of being an evidence, *in the present day*, of the existence of the Church of Christ, I maintain that miracles, either actual or presumed, are a most decisive indication of that church whose members are under

the direct and immediate influence of satanic agency. Listen to the Scripture. The three unclean spirits are said to be "the spirits of *devils working miracles*, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world." "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name?—*and in thy name have cast out devils?*—and in thy name have done many *wonderful works?* And then will I profess unto them I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." In the 13th chapter of Revelations, and at the 14th verse, it is stated that the beast "deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those *miracles* which he had power to do." And again, at the 19th chapter of Revelation, and 20th verse, we have it thus written—"And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought *miracles* before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." We here see that the power of working miracles is directly ascribed to the devil—to the workers of iniquity—to the beast, and to the false prophet. In this instance Dr. Cahill has placed himself in a pleasant sort of company; and, by so doing, he has proved most incontestably that he belongs to a church which is no other than the Mother of Harlots—that great system of iniquity which is so graphically described in the Book of Revelation. The working of miracles is one of the great signs of the apostate church, which can be no other than the Papacy, as it alone claims miraculous power. This is a very interesting subject, and one which is capable of an extensive development, but I cannot dwell any longer on it here.

There are few things, perhaps, of which Roman Catholics boast so much as of the fact that their church reigned triumphant, and was apparently universal, for some time immediately previous to the Reformation, in the 16th century. They take it for granted, without being able to produce the slightest shadow of proof, that theirs is the true church, and then they apply to it all those passages of Scripture which refer to the duration, extent, stability, and absolute indestructibility of the Church of Christ. If they were properly acquainted with the Scriptures, however, they would see that the Church of Christ is not confined to any particular sect or party, but is composed of those individuals out of every class, creed, and clime, who rest their salvation exclusively upon that rock, Christ Jesus, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. The local assemblies of Christians are

usually and properly called the Churches of Christ ; but the term, the Church of Christ, is much more extensive in its signification, and includes within its bounds every individual, without exception, who trusts alone to the finished work of a crucified Saviour. It is not confined to colour or creed, time or place, but embraces the *individual* followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. Hence it results that so long as two or three Christians exist upon the earth, He is not left without a seed to serve him ; and the declaration, " Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," is capable of being fully and literally verified. Although there never was a time in which the world was absolutely and entirely left without a certain number of individual Christians, yet I freely admit that there was a period in which their numbers were so far reduced that they were almost extinguished, and the remnant were obliged to protect their lives by concealing themselves in the impenetrable dens and caves of the earth. If the Alpine mountains were of no other use, they certainly fulfilled a noble purpose and design in protecting, in their inaccessible fastnesses, the brave Piedmontois from the ruthless and hard-hearted barbarities of their relentless pursuers. Strange as it may appear to my Roman Catholic readers, I not only admit, but I glory in the admission, and if necessary would undertake to prove, that for some time preceding the Reformation, in the 16th century, there was not a single example of a number of Christians meeting together in a public capacity for the worship of God. Individual Christians were scattered here and there ; but there was not one instance, in the whole world, of a public assembly of Christians. And why, it may be asked, am I so singular as to glory in this fact ? Just because it appears to me an indisputable evidence, on Scripture authority, that the religion of the persecuted is the religion of Jesus ; and also that the church which was so generally triumphant is no other than that great system of iniquity which is foretold in the Bible,

Speaking of the Mother of Harlots, John says in the Revelation, " And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." To whom is this applicable ? Let the history of the Crusades—the persecutions of the Waldenses—the tortures of the Inquisition, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew give the answer. Roman Catholics, for their own aggrandizement, and for the purpose of rendering their power and religion predominant at present in this land, may call out, liberty, liberty, freedom, and equality ; but they are as little to be

trusted as the untameable hyena; and real freedom, either civil or religious, is as irreconcilable with their creed, as godliness is incompatible with the occupations of the devil.—What says the Council of Toledo? “We, the holy council, promulgate this sentence, pleasing to God, that whosoever hereafter shall succeed to the kingdom, shall not mount the throne till he hath sworn to permit no man to live in his kingdom who is not a Catholic. And if, after he hath taken the reins of government, he shall violate his promise, let him be *anathema maranatha* in the sight of the eternal God, and *fuel for eternal fire.*” The Fourth Council of Lateran, not only decrees that the temporal lord who neglects to *purge* his dominions of *heresy*, shall have his subjects absolved from fealty to him, and shall have his lands offered “to Catholics, who shall possess it, and hold it in purity of faith without dispute, *when the heretics are exterminated;*” but actually proceeds to say that “those Catholics, who, taking up the cross, *have armed themselves for the extermination of the heretics,* shall *enjoy the same indulgence,* and be furnished with the same holy privilege which is granted to those who go to the aid of the holy land.” Here are two specimens, out of the many, of the liberty which is granted by the “*infallible church.*”—There is a feeling at present abroad amongst spurious Protestants, that Papists are now as credible and trustworthy, and as ardent admirers of liberty as other men; but the parties who hold this opinion must be grossly ignorant of the history of the past, as well as of the indelible sentiments of Roman Catholics themselves. How are we to overlook their conduct in past generations, which is uninterruptedly marked with treachery, perfidy, perjury, and the most fiendish persecutions that ever were heard of? Are we to learn no lesson from the history of our ancestors? Are the dear and blood-bought liberties of our forefathers to be for ever sacrificed on the altar of a spurious liberality? Is the ferocious tiger to be let loose for the purpose of sucking the blood of our offspring? Surely not. By all means, let the Papist enjoy full liberty of conscience in religious worship; but let us not pay for the support of his idolatry, nor yet place him in such a position in civil affairs as will enable him to press on, as he is now doing, till he would extinguish every ray of liberty which we at present possess. These sentiments may be considered harsh and severe; but I defy any man to show they are untrue. Individuals may talk of the march of intellect, the enlightenment of the 19th century, and the altered feelings of Roman Catholics; but I would lend a deaf ear to them all so long as Po-

perjury inculcates the telling of lies, the breach of oaths, the extirpation of heretics, the annihilation of private judgment, and the pardon of sin for pecuniary considerations. The enlightenment of the age might put an end to the black deeds of the past, were it not that the same persecuting creed still continues. Why are we to argue that the creed of the Papist is changed, whilst he utterly denies the fact himself? Why are we to give him credit for improvement, when he positively affirms that he is *infallible, unchanged and unchangeable*?—Let him change his *creed* and his *practice*, and I will most willingly change my opinions. My hatred of Popery arises altogether from the fact that I know from its history, and especially from its creed,* that it is altogether inconsistent with civil and religious liberty.

That Popery has an insatiable thirst for blood, may be proved by the following facts. Pope Julius was the occasion of the slaughter of 200,000 Christians. The massacre in France cut off 100,000. In the persecution of the Albigenses and Waldenses 1,000,000 were destroyed. The Duke of Alva put 36,000 to death. The Inquisition tortured the life out of 150,000. The Irish rebellion put an end to 300,000. It is calculated that the deaths from Popish persecution averaged eighty thousand a year, for the period of six hundred years!!! Was anything equal to this ever heard of? Need I go any farther for evidence to prove that the Church of Rome is that identical harlot which is described in Scripture as being drunk with the blood of the Saints? To what other church in the whole history of the world could this description be applied? Verily her track is stained with the foulest deeds which ever were recorded in the annals of the universe. She boasts of her unity and universality; but, to her eternal disgrace be it told, they were obtained by an uninterrupted course of profligacy, debauchery, persecution, and torture, which could not be excelled by all the fiends in the infernal regions. To her alone belongs the crime of being glutted and overwhelmed with the blood of the countless thousands of those who have suffered martyrdom as the Saints of the Most High God. She cannot—she dare not—deny the facts. They are indelibly written upon the history of the past; and the despotic, illiberal, and extremely tyrannical conduct of Papists at present over all parts of the world, whilst the cry of heaven born liberty is polluted by resting on their

* When I speak of the *creed* of the Papist, of course I include in it all the sacred canons, the decrees of Councils, the Bulls of Popes, and all the doctrines which are contained in those books that are approved of by the heads of the church. In short, I extend the word *creed* to everything which, by the laws of his church, the Papist is obliged to believe and practice.

hypocritical lips, proclaims with stentorian voice what they intend to do for the future.

We read in the 11th chapter of Revelation that when the witnesses for the truth "shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, *and shall overcome them and kill them.*—Here the beast is represented as victorious, and the witnesses for the truth are *overcome and killed*. Was this not absolutely and literally verified in the fifteenth century, when the Papists reigned triumphant, and the Christians were overcome and killed almost to a man? Do these facts not prove incontrovertibly that the beast here spoken of is the Papacy which established its cause in the blood of those who publicly opposed its sway? "About the year 1467," says Fleming, "the Waldenses in Austria and Moravia had complied so far as to dissemble that religion, and turn to Popery in profession and outward compliance. The Taborites, in the meantime, upon their refusal to do so, were so destroyed, that it was much that seventy of them could get together to consult about continuing the Church. And so low was the Church of Christ then, that when the hidden remains of the Taborites sent out four men to travel—one through Greece, and the East; another to Russia, and the North; a third to Thrace, Bulgaria, and the neighbouring places; and a fourth to Asia, Palestine, and Egypt; they did all, indeed, safely return to their brethren, but with this sorrowful news—that they found no Church of Christ that was pure or free from the grossest errors, superstition and idolatry. This was in the year 1497. And when they sent two of their number two years afterwards—Luke Prage and Thomas German—to go into Italy, France, and other places, to see if there were any of the old Waldenses left alive, they returned with the same melancholy news as the former had done, that they could neither find nor hear of any remaining; only they were informed of the martyrdom of Savanarolla, and they were told of some few remains of the Piedmontois that were scattered and hid amongst the Alps. Now, a few years after this, even the few remains of the Taborites were found out and persecuted, hardly any escaping; so that in the year 1510, six suffered together publicly, and the year following, that famous martyr, Andreas Paliwka, who was the last of that period." Here, then, we see that the beast, or Rome, was universally triumphant, and the Christians were so far exterminated, that they could not any longer make a public profession of the truth—they were overcome and killed, as was prophesied in the book of Revelation.

We read further—"And they of the people, and kindreds,

and tongues, and nations, shall see their dead bodies three days and an half," which, in prophetic language, means three years and an half; and they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another." In what a remarkable manner was this fulfilled in the meeting of the Lateran Council, which was composed of Priests and Prelates from all parts, at Rome, on the 5th of May, 1514. On that remarkable day, when "they of the people, and kindreds, and tongues, and nations," were all assembled, did the orator of the session ascend the pulpit, and, with the full approbation of the Council, utter the ever memorable sentence—"there is an end of resistance to the Papal rule and religion." Thus was the Scripture verified and fulfilled. This public proclamation proves most completely that the council and court of Rome considered the witnesses as slain, because they had extinguished every organized society which had ventured to hold up its head against them. It was so ordered, however, by an allwise Providence, that they could not stop here. The statement of Christ—"lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," must be fulfilled. His followers might be very far reduced, and must be prevented from worshipping in an assembled capacity, as the Scriptures indicate; but it was not possible for them to be altogether annihilated. That they were not altogether extinguished, is made evident by the fact that the same Lateran Council, on the same 5th day of May, 1514, when they could not lay their hands upon them, because, in place of being gathered into public bodies, they were hid in the dens and caves of the earth, "issued an edict, cutting off all heretics of whatever kind, and of whatever nation, from the Church, and decreeing against them the usual punishments." The existence of a remnant was thus proved out of the mouth of their opponents. If a number of Christians were not known to exist, what was the use of issuing a decree against them? The conduct of the Papists at this period fulfills the Scripture completely, and also proves that their Church is that great system of iniquity which is held forth in the Prophecies of Revelation.

The day of triumph was come, but it did not last long. Its time was precisely marked out by the words of Scripture, which follow—"and after three days and an half," which, in prophetic language, means three years and an half, "the Spirit of Life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet, and great fear fell upon them which saw them." Could any words describe more plainly the condition of the Church of Christ and the Church of Rome, at the

period of the Reformation? We have here the previous downfallen condition of the Christians; the new life entering into them; their standing with public boldness upon their feet; and the great fear that fell upon all those who had previously been persecuting them. All who have read the history of those times, must see that the description is full to the very life. Although the Christians were supposed to be for ever conquered, they got new life, all of a sudden, and stood firm and erect upon their feet, to the great astonishment and dismay of the whole Papal world. Observe also the remarkable precision of the time—the Christians were so persecuted and slain by the Papists that for the space of three years and an half there was not one church to be found in the world—from the 5th of May, 1514, the day on which it was triumphantly and authoritatively announced that “there is an end of resistance to the Papal rule and religion,” until the 31st of October, 1517, the ever-memorable day on which Luther posted up his theses at Wittenberg—thus confirming the Scripture prophecy to a single day! In place of asking us, then, where our religion was before Luther, if Papists would consult the Scriptures, and the history of the world, they would see that the triumphs of which they boast in the beginning of the 16th century are the most certain proofs which could possibly be imagined for the fact that their church is no other than the Mystery of Iniquity, of which we read in the Book of Revelation. After all, it is little wonder that the Bible is kept from the laity, as its free circulation would soon open their eyes to the real condition of their presumptuous guides.

I have not space to enter any farther into this question at present, but I would earnestly recommend all my readers to peruse most carefully the book called “The Seventh Vial,” and the work by Fleming on the Papacy. Mr. Fleming’s book is one of the most remarkable I ever read. Although it was published so long since as the year 1701, it foretold, by a simple interpretation of the Scripture prophecies, the first French revolution, as well as the downfall of the Pope in the year 1848, and his subsequent return to power. Mr. Fleming states further, that the Turkish Empire is to be destroyed between 1848 and 1900; and, that after that, Mahometanism is to be superseded by an almost universal spread of Popery over the world. Who, now, can doubt that these things are actually going to take place before our eyes? Popery must yet rise to a great height before its final downfall, at the end of the year 2000; but woe to the man who will now lend a helping hand, in any respect, to raise it to that

pitch which will enable it to perform over again its bloody deeds, by persecuting those who are to succeed us on the stage of time. No man could read Fleming's interpretations of prophecy without being fully satisfied that the Bible which contains these prophecies, pointing, as they do, so plainly—so palpably—so unmistakeably to the iniquitous course which has hitherto been followed, and will still be followed, for some time longer, by the Church of Rome, must be the Word of the very living God.

I have now concluded my observations on Dr. Cahill's sermon—I leave it to my readers to say how I have fulfilled my task. One thing, however, is certain, I have endeavoured to answer *all* his arguments, in favour of Transubstantiation, which have been reported to me by a competent and faithful reporter. If he thinks I have omitted anything, or if he can produce any stronger arguments, he has only to state them through your columns, and I flatter myself I will not run away from them. The conduct of the priests in avoiding discussion, and also in precluding their followers from entering on the same, cannot be overlooked. It proves that they are the greatest cowards in the world, or else that they know perfectly well their system is false. A *brave* man will not turn his back and run away when he is assailed, and the individual who feels he has *truth* on his side never fears to defend it, as he knows it is as immutable as the heavens, and must come out clearer and clearer the more it is examined and tested. Truth defies all the assaults of its enemies. Popery cannot bear discussion, as it quails under the truth which is elicited thereby. Dr. Cahill takes high ground in refusing discussion—namely, that he acts under infallible authority in believing as he does. But I ask, if this is true, is it not the best reason in the world why he should defend his opinions by discussion? If he has infallible authority for them, no man on earth could overturn them, and he must always come off victorious. The man who is resting upon infallibility has no need to be a coward. There is a secret, however, beyond this blustering. The infallibility is only assumed—he cannot prove it. He assumes the infallibility—Protestants all deny its existence. Is there not a proper reason for discussion here? If he establishes that his church is infallible, he has gained the day. In place of merely assuming his position, let him come forward like a man, and throw aside his cowardice, and prove that his church is infallible. His conduct reminds me of the man who would undertake to move the world with a crow-bar, if he only got a fulcrum to rest upon. Here the moving of the world is evidently possible—the whole point is the fulcrum to rest the bar upon. So is it with Popery.

If it is infallible it is all right; but it surely requires to establish its own infallibility by some decisive evidence, in place of strutting about with the cry, I am infallible, I am infallible.

At one time I had intended to say something on the confessional; but on looking over the extracts* which have been taken from the Class Books of Maynooth on this subject, I find it would be impossible to punish them in your paper.—My astonishment was great, indeed, when I read in these books that it is frequently allowable to tell lies, to steal, to swear falsely, and to break oaths; but when I read the questions which the priests are to put to females in the confessional, I was perfectly amazed to think that any individual could be found in the whole human family sufficiently degraded, and so deeply immersed in blackguardism, as to be able to invent them. How such things could have entered into the mind of man, even in his lowest condition, is more than I can tell. Anything half equal to them I never saw or heard of. They are disgusting and revolting in the very extreme. The man who, after reading these things, will put confidence in the chastity of the priests, to say the least of it, has an ample stock of credulity. It is no wonder the priests are so much opposed to the inspection of nunneries—those convenient places in which they revel. They are like the man whose house is stocked with stolen goods, they will never open the door which unfolds their iniquity so long as they can possibly avoid it.

I will now conclude by appropriating to what I have written, the following from my father:—"Were I influenced by a love of popularity, or of gain, I would take a different course. It cannot be agreeable to my feelings, nor to my temporal interests, to expose myself to the censure of such a portion of my countrymen. Doubtless it would be more soothing to vanity to figure at a conciliation dinner, and, by the sacrifice of truth, to gain the honour of liberality. But the day will come, my brethren, when yourselves will acknowledge that there was more friendship, as well as honesty, in my plain dealing, than all the deceiving complaisance of your Protestant flatterers. I love you, as men; as far as in my power, I will ever rejoice to do you service, both temporally and spiritually; but on my allegiance to God, I cannot deceive you. I know, assuredly, that your religion is false, and truth and duty compel me to publish my conviction. Judge me not, then, an enemy because I tell you the truth."

Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for having so readily published my letters, I am, very truly yours.

Coleraine, August 30, 1853.

* See "The Confessional Unmasked," published by W. Carson, 61, Grafton-st., Dublin, 1852—Price 1s. 6d.